arXiv:1107.5762v1 [math.RT] 28 Jul 2011

THE GEOMETRICAL SATAKE CORRESPONDENCE FOR RAMIFIED GROUPS

XINWEN ZHU

Abstract. We prove the geometrical Satake isomorphism for a reductive group defined over $F = k((t))$, and split over a tamely ramified extension. As an application, we give a description of the nearby cycles on certain Shimura varieties via the Rapoport-Zink-Pappas local models.

Contents

Introduction 1
1. Reminders on the affine flag variety associated to a special parahoric 5
2. Construction of the functor $\mathcal{Z}$ 6
3. $\mathcal{Z}$ is a central functor 9
4. Identification of the group $\tilde{G}^\vee$ with $(H^\vee)^I$ 11
5. IC-stalks, q-analogy of the weight multiplicity, and the Lusztig-Kato polynomial 16
6. The Langlands parameter 21
7. Applications to the nearby cycles on certain Shimura varieties 23
Appendix A. The full Langlands dual group 28
References 32

Introduction

The Satake isomorphism (for unramified groups) is the starting point of the Langlands duality. Let us first recall its statement. Let F be a non-archimedean local field with ring of integers $\mathcal{O}$ and residue field k, and let G be a connected unramified reductive group over F. Let $A \subset G$ a maximal split torus of G. Let W_0 be the Weyl group of (G, A). Let K be a hyperspecial subgroup of $G(F)$ containing $A(\mathcal{O})$. Then the classical Satake isomorphism described the Hecke algebra $\mathrm{Sph} = C_c(K \setminus G(F)/K)$, the algebra of compactly supported bi-K-invariant functions on $G(F)$ under the convolutions. Namely, there is an isomorphism of algebras

$$\mathrm{Sph} \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(A)]^{W_0}.$$

If F has positive characteristic $p > 0$, then the classical Satake correspondence has a vast enhancement. Let Gr_G be the affine Grassmannian of G. Choose ℓ a prime different from p, and let Sat_G be the category of $(K \otimes \bar{k})$-equivariant perverse sheaves with $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-coefficients on $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes \bar{k}$. Then it is a Tannakian category and there is an equivalence

$$\mathrm{Sat}_G \simeq \mathrm{Rep}(G^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}),$$

where $G^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}$ is the dual group of G and $\mathrm{Rep}(G^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell})$ is the tensor category of algebraic representations of $G^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}$ (cf. [Gi, MV]).

Date: July 2011.

There is also a version of Satake isomorphism for arbitrary reductive group over F, as recently proved by Haines and Rostami (cf. [HR])[1]. Namely, let $\mathcal{B}(G)$ be the Bruhat-Tits building of G and $v\in\mathcal{B}(G)$ be a special vertex. Let $K_v\subset G(F)$ be the special parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$ corresponding to v. Let A be a maximal split F-torus of G such that $K_v\supset A(\mathcal{O})$, let M be the centralizer of A in G and $W_0=N_G(A)/M$ be the Weyl group as before. Let M_1 be the unique parahoric subgroup of $M(F)$. Let $\Lambda_M=M(F)/M_1$, which is a finitely generated abelian group. Then

$$C_c(K_v\setminus G(F)/K_v)\simeq\mathbb{C}[\Lambda_M]^{W_0}. \tag{0.1}$$

More explicitly, if G is quasi-split so that $M=T$ is a maximal torus. Then

$$\Lambda_M=\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma,$$

where $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)$ is the coweight lattice of T, I is the inertial group and σ is the Frobenius.

The goal of this paper is supply a geometric version of the above isomorphism when F has positive characteristic p and the group G is quasi-split and splits over a *tamely* ramified extension. More precisely, let k be an algebraically closed field and let $\ell\neq\operatorname{char}k$ be a prime. Let G be a group over the local field $F=k((t))$ (so that G is quasi-split automorphically), which is split over a tamely ramified extension. That is, there is a finite extension $\tilde{F}/F$ such that $G_{\tilde{F}}$ is split and $\operatorname{char}k\nmid[\tilde{F}:F]$. Let $v\in\mathcal{B}(G)$ be a special vertex in the building of G and let $\underline{G}_v$ be the parahoric group scheme over $\mathcal{O}=k[[t]]$ (in the sense of Bruhat-Tits), determined by v. We write $K_v=L^+\underline{G}_v$ to be its jet space. Consider the affine flag variety

$$\mathcal{F}\ell_v=LG/K_v,$$

where LG is the loop group of G. Let $\mathcal{P}_v=\mathcal{P}_{K_v}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$ be the category of K_v-equivariant perverse sheaf on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, with coefficients in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. Let H be a split Chevalley group over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $G\otimes_F F^s\simeq H\otimes F^s$. Then up to conjugacy, there is a natural action of $I=\operatorname{Gal}(F^s/F)$ on $H^\vee:=H^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}$ (via pinned automorphisms).

Theorem 0.1. *The category $\mathcal{P}_v$ has a natural tensor structure. In addition, as tensor categories, there is an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{RS}:\operatorname{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)\simeq\mathcal{P}_v,$$

such that $\mathrm{H}^*\circ\mathcal{RS}$ is isomorphic to the forgetful functor, where H^* is the hypercohomology functor.

By Lemma 4.6, this theorem is a categorification of (0.1).

Let us point out the following remarkable facts when the group is ramified. First, the group $(H^\vee)^I$ is not necessarily connected as is shown in Remark (4.3). Second, it is well-known that if G is unramified over F, then all the hyperspecial subgroups of G are conjugate under $G_{\mathrm{ad}}(F)$, where G_{ad} is the adjoint group of G. However, this is no longer true for special parahoric of G if G is ramified. An example is given by the odd ramified unitary similitude group GU_{2m+1}. There are essentially two types of special parahorics of GU_{2m+1}, as given in (7.1). One of them has reductive quotient GO_{2m+1} (corresponding to $\underline{G}_{v_0}$), and the other (corresponding to $\underline{G}_{v_1}$) has reductive quotient GSp_{2m}. Accordingly, the geometry of corresponding flag varieties $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_0}$ and $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_1}$ are very different, while $\mathcal{P}_{v_0}\simeq\mathcal{P}_{v_1}$. Indeed, their Schubert varieties (i.e. closures of K_{v_i}-orbits) are both parameterized by irreducible representation of GO_{2m+1}. Let $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_0\bar{\mu}_{2m,1}}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_1\bar{\mu}_{2m,1}}$) be the Schubert variety in $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_0}$ (resp. $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_1}$) parameterized by the standard representation of GO_{2m+1}. Then it is shown in [Zh2] that $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_0\bar{\mu}_{2m,1}}$ is not Gorenstein, while in [Ri] that $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v_1\bar{\mu}_{2m,1}}$ is smooth. On the other hand, the intersection cohomology of both varieties give the standard representation of GO_{2m+1}. In addition, the stalk cohomology of both sheaves are the "same". See Theorem 0.3 below.

---

[1] There is another version, known long time ago, as in [Car].

Remark 0.1. Instead of considering a special parahoric K_v of LG, one can begin with the special maximal "compact" K'_v, (i.e. $K'_v = L^+\underline{G}'_v$, where $\underline{G}'_v$ is the stabilizer group scheme of v as constructed by Bruhat-Tits), and consider the category of K'_v-equivariant perverse sheaves on LG/K'_v. However, from geometrical point of view, this is less natural since K'_v is not necessarily connected and the category of K'_v-equivariant perverse sheaves is complicated. In fact, we do not how to relate this category to the Langlands dual group yet. In addition, when we discuss the Langlands parameters in Sect. 6, it is also more "correct" to consider K_v rather that K'_v.

The proof of this theorem is indeed simple. Namely, using Gaitsgory's nearby cycle functor construction as in [G1, Zh2], we construct a functor

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathrm{Sat}_H \to \mathcal{P}_v,$$

which is a central functor in the sense of [Be]. By general nonsense, this already implies that $\mathcal{P}_v \simeq \mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee)$ for certain closed subgroup $\tilde{G}^\vee \subset H^\vee$. Then we identify $\tilde{G}^\vee$ with $(H^\vee)^I$ using the explicit geometry of $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$.

Remark 0.2. We believe that the same argument (maybe with small modifications) should work for groups split over a wild ramified extension. However, we have not checked it carefully.

When the group G is a quasi-split over the non-archimedean local field $F = \mathbb{F}_q((t))$ and v is a special vertex of $\mathcal{B}(G, F)$, the affine flag variety $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$. We can consider the category of K_v-equivariant semi-simple perverse sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, pure of weight zero, and denote it by $\mathcal{P}_v^0$. On the other hand, let I be the inertial group of F and σ be the Frobenius of $\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$, where $k = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$. Then the pinned action of $\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ on $H^\vee$ induces a canonical action of σ on $(H^\vee)^I$, denoted by act^{alg}. One can form the semidirect product $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$, which can be regarded as a proalgebraic group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$, and consider the category of algebraic representations of $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$, denoted by $\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q))$.

Theorem 0.2. *In this case, the functor $\mathcal{RS}$ in Theorem 0.1 can be extended to an equivalence*

$$\mathcal{RS} : \mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)) \simeq \mathcal{P}_v^0,$$

whose composition with H^* *is isomorphic to the forgetful functor.*

Let us mention that under this equivalence, the restriction to $\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$ of the representation $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{P}_v^0$ is NOT the natural Galois action of $\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$ on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F})$. However, their difference can be described explicitly. See Sect. 4 and Appendix for more details.

Our next result is to use the ramified geometrical Satake isomorphism to obtain the stalk cohomology of sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ (i.e. the corresponding Lusztig-Kato polynomial in ramified case), following an idea of Ginzburg (cf. [Gi]). Let us state the result precisely. The centralizer of A in our case is a maximal torus of G, denoted by T. Then the K-orbits on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ are labeled by $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I/W_0$, W_0-orbits of the coinvariants of the cocharacter group of T. For $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$, let $\mathring{\mathcal{F}\ell}_{v\bar{\mu}}$ be the corresponding orbit. One the other hand, for a representation V of $(H^\vee)^I$, let $V(\bar{\mu})$ be the weight space of V for $(T^\vee)^I$. Let $X^\vee \in \mathrm{Lie}(H^\vee)^I$ be certain principal nilpotent element (see Sect. 5 for the details), which induces a filtration $F_iV(\bar{\mu}) = (\ker X^\vee)^{i+1} \cap V(\bar{\mu})$ on $V(\bar{\mu})$, called the Brylinski-Kostant filtration. Then we have

Theorem 0.3. *For $V \in \mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)$, and $\mathcal{RS}(V) \in \mathcal{P}_v$ be the corresponding sheaf.*

$$\dim \mathcal{H}^{2i-(2\rho,\bar{\mu})}\mathcal{RS}(V)|_{\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}}} = \dim \mathrm{gr}_i^F V(\bar{\mu}).$$

Here $\mathcal{H}^*$ denotes the cohomology sheaves, and 2ρ is the sum of positive roots of H, see Sect. 1 for the meaning of $(2\rho, \bar{\mu})$.

One of our main motivations of this work is to apply the these results to the calculation of the nearby cycles of certain ramified unitary Shimura varieties, via the Rapoport-Zink-Pappas local models. For example, we obtain the following theorem (see Sect. 7 for details).

Theorem 0.4. *Let $G = \mathrm{GU}(r, s)$ be a unitary similitude group associated to an imaginary quadratic extension $F/\mathbb{Q}$ and a hermitian space (W, ϕ) over $F/\mathbb{Q}$. Let $p > 2$ be a prime where $F/\mathbb{Q}$ is ramified and the hermitian form is split. Let K_p be a special parahoric subgroup of $G = G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$. Let $K = K_pK^p \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_p)G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$ be a compact open subgroup with K^p small enough. Let Sh_K be the associated Shimura variety over the reflex field E and Sh_{K_p} be the integral model of Sh_K over $\mathcal{O}_{E_p}$ (as defined in* [PR2]*). Then for $\ell \neq p$, the action of the inertial subgroup I of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/F_p)$ on the nearby cycle $\Psi_{Sh_{K_p}\otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{E_p}}\mathcal{O}_{F_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$ is trivial.*

By applying Theorem 0.3, it will not be hard to determine the traces of Frobenius on these sheaves explicitly, which will be the input of the Langlands-Kottwitz method to determine the local Zeta factors of Sh_K. Instead, we characterize these traces of Frobenius in terms of Langlands parameters, which verifies a conjecture of Haines and Kottwitz in this case (see Proposition 7.4).

Remark 0.3. (i) While the definition of the integral model of a PEL-type Shimura variety at an "unramified" prime p (i.e. the group is unramified at p and K_p is hyperspecial) is well-known, the definition of such a model at the ramified prime p (even for K_p special) is a subtle issue. In [Pa, PR2], the integral models Sh_{K_p} are defined as certain closed subschemes of certain moduli problems of abelian varieties. Except a few cases (e.g. $(r, s) = (n-1, 1)$ and $n = r + s$ is small), there is no moduli description of Sh_{K_p} so far. In general, Sh_{K_p} are not smooth. Indeed, as shown in [Pa, PR2], when $n = r+s$ is odd and $(r, s) = (n-1, 1)$, for the special parahoric K_p of $G(\mathbb{Q}_p)$ with reductive quotient GO_n, Sh_{K_p} is not even semi-stable.

(ii) If $r \neq s$, then we know that $E = F$ and the above theorem gives a complete description of the monodromy on the nearby cycles of Sh_{K_p}. If $r = s$, then $E = \mathbb{Q}$, and the complete description of the monodromy is more complicated. See Sect. 7 for details. In any case, the action of inertial on the nearby cycle is semi-simple.

(iii) We hope that there will be a "good" compactification of such Shimura varieties Sh_{K_p}. Then the above theorem, together with the existence of such compactification, would imply that the monodromy of $H_c^*(Sh_K \otimes_{E_p} F_p)$ is trivial.

Let us quickly describe the organization of the paper. We will prove Theorem 0.1 and Theorem 0.2 in §1-4. Then we prove Theorem 0.3 in §5.

In §6, we briefly discuss the langlands parameters associated to a smooth representation of a quasi-split p-adic group, which has a vector fixed by a special parahoric. We call them "unramified" representations, and we will see that their Langlands parameters can be described easily. Again, the correct point of view is to consider the special parahoric rather than the special maximal compact. Then §7, we apply the previous results to study the nearby cycles on certain unitary Shimura varieties.

The paper contains an appendix, joint with T. Richarz, where we recover the full Langlands dual group from geometry. In particular, we give the geometrical Satake correspondence for unramified groups. We hope that this formulation will be of independent interests.

Notations. Let k be a field. We denote k^s to be its separable closure.

For a (not necessarily connected) diagonalizable algebraic group C defined over a field F, we denote $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)$ its group of characters and $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)$ its group of cocharacters over the separable closure F^s. The Galois group $I = \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ acts on $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)$ (resp. $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)$) and the invariants (resp. coinvariants) are denoted by $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)^I$ (resp. $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)_I, \mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)^I, \mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)_I$). We will always use $\lambda, \mu, \dots$ to denote elements in $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)$ or $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)$ and $\bar{\lambda}, \bar{\mu}$ to denote elements in $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(C)_I$ or $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(C)_I$. In general, let I be a group acting on a set S. We denote S^I to be the subset of fixed points.

If G is an algebraic group defined over a field k, we denote $\mathrm{Rep}(G)$ the category of finite dimensional representations of G.

Let k be a field and $\mathcal{O} = k[[t]], F = k(\!(t)\!) := k[[t]][t^{-1}]$. For an $\mathcal{O}$-scheme X, we denote L^+X to be the jet space over k so that for any k-algebra R, $L^+X(R) = X(R[[t]])$. For an F-scheme X, we denote LX to be its loop space so that $LX(R) = X(R(\!(t)\!))$. If X is defined over k, we write L^+X for $L^+(X \otimes \mathcal{O})$ and LX for $L(X \otimes F)$ for brevity.

For a variety X over k, we denote $D(X)$ the usual (bounded) derived category of ℓ-adic sheaves on X ($\ell \nmid \mathrm{char}\, k$). If $X = \lim X_i$ is an ind-scheme of ind-finite type, $D(X) = \lim D(X_i)$ as usual. If there is an action of an algebraic group G on X, the G-equivariant derived category is denoted by $D_G(X)$. All the functors like $f_*, f_!, f^*, f^!$ are understood in the derived sense unless otherwise specified.

Acknowledgement. The author would like to thank D. Gaitsgory, T. Haines, I. Mirković, G. Pappas, M. Rapoport, T. Richarz, E. Urban, Z. Yun for useful discussions. The author also thanks the hospitality of Tsinghua University, where part of the work is done. The work of the author is supported by the NSF grant under DMS-1001280.

1. Reminders on the affine flag variety associated to a special parahoric

In this section, we collect basic facts about the affine flag varieties associated to a special parahoric of G. Another purpose of this section is to fix notations that are used in the later sections.

As before, let k be an algebraically closed field and let G be a group over the local field $F = k(\!(t)\!)$, which is split over a tamely ramified extension. Let us choose A to be a maximal F-split torus of G and T be its centralizer. Then T is a maximal torus of G since G is quasi-split. Let us choose a rational Borel subgroup $B \supset T$.

Let H be a split Chevalley group over $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $H \otimes F^s \simeq G \otimes F^s$. We need to choose this isomorphism carefully. Let us fix a pinning (H, B_H, T_H, X) of H over $\mathbb{Z}$. Let us recall that this means that B_H is a Borel subgroup of H, T_H is a split maximal torus contained B_H, and $X = \Sigma_{\tilde{a} \in \Delta_H} X_{\tilde{a}} \in \mathrm{Lie} B$, where Δ_H is the set of simple roots of H, $\tilde{U}_{\tilde{a}}$ is the root subgroup corresponding to $\tilde{a}$ and $X_{\tilde{a}}$ is a generator in the rank one free $\mathbb{Z}$-module $\mathrm{Lie}\tilde{U}_{\tilde{a}}$. Let Ξ be the group of pinned automorphisms of (H, B_H, T_H, X), which is canonically isomorphic to the group of the automorphisms of the root datum $(\mathbb{X}^\bullet(T_H), \Delta_H, \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H), \Delta_H^\vee)$.

Let us choose an isomorphism $(G, B, T) \otimes_F \tilde{F} \simeq (H, B_H, T_H) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{F}$, where $\tilde{F}/F$ is a cyclic extension such that $G \otimes \tilde{F}$ splits. This induces an isomorphism of the root data $(\mathbb{X}^\bullet(T_H), \Delta_H, \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H), \Delta_H^\vee) \simeq (\mathbb{X}^\bullet(T), \Delta, \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T), \Delta^\vee)$. Now the action of $I = \mathrm{Gal}(\tilde{F}/F)$ on $G \otimes_F \tilde{F}$ induces a homomorphism $\psi : I \to \Xi$. Then we can always choose an isomorphism

$$(G, B, T) \otimes_F \tilde{F} \simeq (H, B_H, T_H) \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \tilde{F} \tag{1.1}$$

such that the action of $\gamma \in I$ on the left hand side corresponds to $\psi(\gamma) \otimes \gamma$. In the rest of the paper, we fix such an isomorphism.

Recall that the Kottwitz homomorphism $\kappa : T(F) \to \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ induces an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I \simeq T(F)/\underline{T}^{\flat,0}(\mathcal{O}),$$

where $\underline{T}^{\flat,0}$ is the unique parahoric group scheme of T over $\mathcal{O}$ (the connected Néron model). Our convention of Kottwitz homomorphism is that the action of $t \in T(F)$ on $A(G, A)$ (the apartment associated to (G, A)) is given by $v \mapsto v - \kappa(t)$. Let $W_0 = W(G, A)$ be the relative Weyl group of G. It acts on T and therefore on $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$. In addition, its action on the torsion subgroup $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_{I,\mathrm{tor}} \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ is trivial.

The Borel subgroup B determines a set of positive roots $\Phi^+ = \Phi(G, A)^+$ for G. There is a natural map $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I \to \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I \otimes \mathbb{R} \simeq \mathbb{X}_\bullet(A)_{\mathbb{R}}$. We define the set of dominant elements in

$\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ to be

$$\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+ = \{\bar{\mu} | (\bar{\mu}, a) \geq 0 \text{ for } a \in \Phi^+\}. \tag{1.2}$$

Then the natural map $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+ \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I \to \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I/W_0$ is bijective. Let us define an order $\preceq$ on $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ as follows. Let Q_H be the coroot lattice for H. The action of I on Q_H will send the positive coroots of H (determined by the chosen Borel) to positive coroots. Therefore, it makes sense to talk about positive elements in $(Q_H)_I$. Namely, an element in $(Q_H)_I$ is positive if its preimage in Q_H is a sum of positive coroots (of H). Since $(Q_H)_I \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$, we can define for $\lambda, \mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$,

$$\bar{\lambda} \preceq \bar{\mu} \text{ if } \bar{\mu} - \bar{\lambda} \text{ is positive in } (Q_H)_I. \tag{1.3}$$

Let $\underline{G}_v$ be a special parahoric group scheme of G over $\mathcal{O} = k[[t]]$ in the sense of Bruhat-Tits, such that the natural inclusion $A \subset G$ extends to $A_{\mathcal{O}} \subset \underline{G}_v$ (i.e. the vertex v in the building of G corresponding to $\underline{G}_v$ is contained in the apartment $A(G, A)$. For examples of such group schemes, we refer to Sect. 7. We write $K_v = L^+\underline{G}_v$, and consider the affine flag variety

$$\mathcal{F}\ell_v = LG/K_v.$$

This is an ind-projective scheme (cf. [PR1]). As is shown in *loc. cit.*, when G is semi-simple and simply-connected, $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is just a partial flag variety of certain (twisted) affine Kac-Moody group. The K_v-orbits on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ are parameterized by $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$. For $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$, let $s_{\bar{\mu}}$ denote the point in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ corresponding to $\bar{\mu}$. More precisely, it is the image of $\bar{\mu}$ under the map $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I \simeq T(F)/\underline{T}^{\flat,0}(\mathcal{O}) \to G(F)/K_v = \mathcal{F}\ell_v(k)$. Let $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}}$ be the corresponding Schubert variety, i.e. the closure of K-orbit through $s_{\bar{\mu}}$. Then

$$\dim \mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}} = (2\rho, \bar{\mu}),$$

where 2ρ is the sum of all positive roots (for H), and by definition $(2\rho, \bar{\mu}) = (2\rho, \mu)$ for any lift μ of $\bar{\mu}$ to $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)$. In addition, $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\lambda}} \subset \mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}}$ if and only if $\bar{\lambda} \preceq \bar{\mu}$. In this case, $\dim \mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}} - \dim \mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\lambda}}$ is an even integer. For the proof of these facts, see [Ri, Zh2].

Let $\mathcal{P}_v = \mathcal{P}_{K_v}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$ be the category of K_v-equivariant perverse sheaf on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, with coefficients in $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. By the above facts, the dimensions of K_v-orbits in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ have the same parity in each connected component. Therefore, we have

Lemma 1.1. *$\mathcal{P}_v$ is a semi-simple abelian category.*

Proof. By the argument as in [G1, Proposition 1], it is enough to show that the stalks of the intersection cohomology sheaves have the parity vanishing property. But this follows from the existence of Demazure resolutions of Schubert varieties in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ (for example see [G1, A.7]). More precisely, the existence of such resolutions were constructed in [PR1, Sect. 8] for twisted affine flag varieties. □

In [Zh2, PZ], a natural $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is constructed. In the Kac-Moody setting, it is just the action of the "rotation torus" on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$. Each Schubert cell is invariant under this action.

Corollary 1.2. *Any K_v-equivariant perverse sheaf on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is automatically $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant.*

Proof. Clearly, the intersection complex is $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant. Then the assertion follows from the semisimplicity of $\mathcal{P}_v$. □

2. CONSTRUCTION OF THE FUNCTOR $\mathcal{Z}$

We continue the notations as in the previous sections and let $\underline{G}_v$ be a special parahoric group scheme of G over $\mathcal{O}$. In [Zh2], a group scheme $\mathcal{G}$ over $\mathbb{A}_k^1$ is constructed such that

1. $\mathcal{G}_\eta$ is connected reductive, splits over a (tamely) ramified extension, where η is the generic point of $\mathbb{A}_k^1$;

(2) For some choice of isomorphism $F_0 \simeq F$, $\mathcal{G}_{F_0} \simeq G$;
(3) For any $y \neq 0$, $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_y}$ is hyperspecial, (non-canonically) isomorphic to $H \otimes \mathcal{O}_y$;
(4) $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_0} = \underline{G}_v$ under the isomorphism $\mathcal{G}_{F_0} \simeq G$.

The construction is as follows. Regard I as the Galois group of the cyclic cover $[e] : \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_m$ of degree e. Then the group I acts $H \times \mathbb{G}_m$. Namely, it acts on H via the pinned automorphism $\psi : I \to \Xi$, and on $\mathbb{G}_m$ via transport of structures. Then $\mathcal{G}|_{\mathbb{G}_m} = (\mathrm{Res}_{\mathbb{G}_m/\mathbb{G}_m}(H \times \mathbb{G}_m))^I$, and $\mathcal{G}$ is the extension of it to $\mathbb{A}^1$ so that $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{O}_0} = \underline{G}_v$.

Let $\mathrm{Gr}_\mathcal{G}$ be the global affine Grassmannian of $\mathcal{G}$, which is an ind-scheme over $\mathbb{A}^1$. Recall that it classifies triples $(y, \mathcal{E}, \beta)$ where y is a point on $\mathbb{A}^1_k$, $\mathcal{E}$ is a $\mathcal{G}$-torsor on $\mathbb{A}^1$ and β is a trivialization of this $\mathcal{G}$-torsor away from y. Let $[e] : \mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathbb{A}^1$ be the natural extension of the cyclic cover of $[e] : \mathbb{G}_m \to \mathbb{G}_m$. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G} := \mathrm{Gr}_\mathcal{G} \times_{\mathbb{A}^1,[e]} \mathbb{A}^1$ be the base change. Then

$$(\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G})_0 \simeq \mathcal{F}\ell_v, \qquad \widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G}|_{\mathbb{G}_m} \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_H \times \mathbb{G}_m.$$

Since I acts on H via pinned automorphisms, it acts on Gr_H, still denoted by ψ. The following lemma is clear from the above construction.

Lemma 2.1. *Under the isomorphism* $\mathrm{Gr}_\mathcal{G} \times_{\mathbb{G}_m} \mathbb{G}_m \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_H \times \mathbb{G}_m$*, the action of* $\gamma \in I$ *on the left hand side (via the Galois action on the second factor) corresponds to the action of* $\psi(\gamma) \times \gamma$ *on the right hand side.*

Remark 2.1. One should be warning that $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G} \neq \mathrm{Gr}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}}$, where $\widetilde{\mathcal{G}}$ is the base change of $\mathcal{G}$ along $[e] : \mathbb{A}^1 \to \mathbb{A}^1$.

Recall that we denote Sat_H to be the Satake category for H, i.e., the category of L^+H-equivariant perverse sheaves on Gr_H, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)$ via the geometrical Satake correspondence. Let denote

$$\mathcal{S} : \mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee) \to \mathrm{Sat}_H \tag{2.1}$$

be such an equivalence. We define a functor

$$\mathcal{Z} : \mathrm{Sat}_H \to \mathcal{P}_v$$

by taking the nearby cycle functors. More precisely, let

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}) = \Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]), \tag{2.2}$$

where for an (ind)-scheme $\mathcal{X}$ of (ind)-finite type over $\mathbb{A}^1$, $\Psi_\mathcal{X}$ denotes the usual nearby cycle functor.

Lemma 2.2. *The monodromy of* $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$ *is trivial.*

Proof. This follows from the fact that there is a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G}$ making the natural map $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G} \to \mathbb{A}^1$ a $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant morphism, where $\mathbb{G}_m$ acts on $\mathbb{A}^1$ via natural dilatations (cf. [Zh2, PZ]). In addition, the restriction of this $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $(\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G})_0 = \mathcal{F}\ell_v$ coincides with the action of the "rotation torus" on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ as mentioned in Lemma 1.2.

Then for any $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Sat}_H$, the sheaf $\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]$ is $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant so that the monodromy of the nearby cycle $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}) = \Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ is opposite the $\mathbb{G}_m$-monodromic action on $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$ (see [Zh2, §6.2] for the notations of $\mathbb{G}_m$-monodromic sheaves and $\mathbb{G}_m$-monodromic actions). By Corollary 1.2, $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$ is $\mathbb{G}_m$-equivariant so that the monodromy is trivial. □

Remark 2.2. A mixed characteristic analogue of this lemma also holds (Theorem 7.2).

Let $i_0 : (\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G})_0 \to \widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G}$ be the closed embedding of the special fiber and $j : \widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G} \setminus (\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mathcal{G})_0$ be the open complement.

Corollary 2.3. *There is a canonical isomorphism* $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}) \simeq i_0^* j_{!*}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$.

Proof. This is standard. Since the monodromy is trivial, From the distinguish triangle

$$i_0^*j_*(\mathcal{F}\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)\to\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})\xrightarrow{0}\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})\to$$

we obtain that $i_0^*j_*(\mathcal{F}\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ lives in perverse cohomological degree 0 and 1, and both cohomology sheaves are isomorphic to $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$. But $i_0^*j_{!*}(\mathcal{F}\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)={}^p\mathrm{H}^0 i_0^*j_*(\mathcal{F}\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$. ☐

In what follows, for $\mathcal{F}\in\mathrm{Sat}_H$, we denote $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{G}_m}=\mathcal{F}\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]$ over $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}$, and $\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{A}^1}=j_{!*}\mathcal{F}_{\mathbb{G}_m}$.

Recall that the irreducible objects in Sat_H are the intersection cohomology sheaves $\mathcal{S}(V_\mu)$ on Gr_H where $\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)^+=\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)^+$. The irreducible objects in $\mathcal{P}_v$ are the intersection cohomology sheaves $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar\mu}$ on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, where $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$. For $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$, let $j_{\bar\mu}:\mathring{\mathcal{F}\ell}{}^{s}_{\bar\mu}\to\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ be the corresponding locally closed embedding of K-orbits.

Lemma 2.4. *For any $\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)^+$, let $\bar\mu$ be its image in $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$. Then $j_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V_\mu))\simeq\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[(2\rho,\mu)]$.*

Proof. Consider $s_\mu\times\mathbb{G}_m\subset\mathrm{Gr}_H\times\mathbb{G}_m\subset\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}$. Since $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is ind-proper over $\mathbb{A}^1$, it extends to a section $\mathbb{A}^1\to\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}$, still denoted by s_μ. By [Zh2, Proposition 3.5], $s_\mu(0)\in\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is just the point $s_{\bar\mu}$, where $\bar\mu$ is the image of μ under $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)\to\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)_I$.

Recall that $\mathcal{S}(V_\mu)$ is supported on $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$, the Schubert variety in Gr_H corresponding to s_μ. Let $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu\subset\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the closure of $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu\times\mathbb{G}_m\subset\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}$. Then by the above fact, $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar\mu}$ is contained in the special fiber of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$. In fact, it is proved in [Zh2] that the special fiber of $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$ is $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar\mu}$. In addition, it is shown in *loc. cit.* that the point $s_{\bar\mu}$ is smooth in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$. The lemma then is clear. ☐

The following key result is established in [G1] and in [Zh2]. Let $\star:\mathcal{P}_v\times\mathcal{P}_v\to D_{K_v}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$ be the usual convolution product functor. For a precise definition, see for example [MV, Zh2].

Proposition 2.5. *For any $\mathcal{F}_1\in\mathrm{Sat}_H$ and $\mathcal{F}_2\in\mathcal{P}_v$, there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)\star\mathcal{F}_2\simeq\mathcal{F}_2\star\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)$ and both are perverse sheaves.*

Let us briefly review the proof. Let us define the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}(R)=\left\{(y,\mathcal{E},\beta)\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}y\in\mathbb{A}^1(R),\mathcal{E}\text{ is a }\mathcal{G}\text{-torsor on }\mathbb{A}^1_R,\text{ and}\\ \beta:\mathcal{E}|_{(\mathbb{G}_m)_R-\Gamma_y}\simeq\mathcal{E}^0|_{(\mathbb{G}_m)_R-\Gamma_y}\text{ is a trivialization}\end{array}\right\}. \tag{2.3}$$

We have

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}\simeq\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}\times(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}})_0,\quad(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD})_0\simeq(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}})_0\simeq\mathcal{F}\ell_v.$$

As before, we denote $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}$ to be the base change along $\mathbb{A}^1\to\mathbb{A}^1$. Over $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}\simeq\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}\times(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}})_0$, we can form the external product $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\boxtimes\mathcal{F}_2$. Then the isomorphism in the proposition is induced from the canonical isomorphisms

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)\star\mathcal{F}_2\simeq\Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}}((\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\boxtimes\mathcal{F}_2)\simeq\mathcal{F}_2\star\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1).$$

Again, since the monodromy of $\Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}^{BD}}((\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\boxtimes\mathcal{F}_2)$ is trivial, we have

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)\star\mathcal{F}_2\simeq i_0^*j_{!*}((\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\boxtimes\mathcal{F}_2)\simeq\mathcal{F}_2\star\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1),$$

where i_0,j are corresponding closed and open embedding.

Corollary 2.6. *The convolution of $\mathcal{P}_v$ is bi-exact. Therefore, $\mathcal{P}_v$ is a monoidal category.*

Proof. The follows from the fact that $\mathcal{P}_v$ is semi-simple and every irreducible object in $\mathcal{P}_v$ is a direct summand of some $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$. Indeed, for $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$, let μ be a lift of it in $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)^+$. Then by Lemma 2.4, IC_μ appears as a direct summand of $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V_\mu))$ with multiplicity one. ☐

Remark 2.3. (i) According to [MV, Remark 4.5], the exactness of the convolution product probably would imply that $LG\times^K\mathcal{F}\ell_v\to\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is (stratified) semi-small.

(ii) By the same argument, the convolution bi-functor $\star:\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)\times\mathcal{P}_v\to\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$ is also exact, where $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$ is the category of perverse sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$.

3. $\mathcal{Z}$ IS A CENTRAL FUNCTOR

In this section, we show that $\mathcal{Z}$ is a central functor in the sense of [Be]. By Lemma 2.4, together with some general nonsense, this already implies that $\mathcal{P}_v$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee)$ for some closed subgroup $\tilde{G}^\vee\subset H^\vee$. In the next section, we will identify $\tilde{G}^\vee$ explicitly. We will also determine a fiber functor of $\mathcal{P}_v$.

Lemma-Definition 3.1. *The functor* $\mathcal{Z}:\mathrm{Sat}_H\to\mathcal{P}_v$ *is naturally a monoidal functor.*

Proof. The proof is literally the same as the proof in [G1, Theorem 1(c)]. We repeat the argument here in order to make the definition of this monoidal structure explicit.

Let $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$ be the ind-scheme over $\mathbb{A}^1$ classifying

$$\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}(R)=\left\{(y,\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}',\beta,\beta')\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{c}y\in\mathbb{A}^1(R),\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}'\text{ are two }\mathcal{G}\text{-torsors}\\ \text{on }\mathbb{A}^1_R,\beta:\mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{A}^1_R-\Gamma_y}\simeq\mathcal{G}|_{\mathbb{A}^1_R-\Gamma_y}\text{ is a}\\ \text{trivialization},\beta':\mathcal{E}'|_{\mathbb{A}^1_R-\Gamma_y}\simeq\mathcal{E}|_{\mathbb{A}^1_R-\Gamma_y}\end{array}\right\}. \tag{3.1}$$

The notation suggests that $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a kind of twisted product. Indeed, let $\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}$ be the global jet group of $\mathcal{G}$ as defined in [Zh2, §3.1], which classifies a point on $\mathbb{A}^1$ and a trivialization of the trivial $\mathcal{G}$-torsor over the formal neighborhood of this point. Then $\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}$ naturally acts on $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$. In addition, there is a $\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}$-torsor over $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$ classifying quadruples $(y,\mathcal{E},\beta,\gamma)$, where the triple $(y,\mathcal{E},\beta)$ is as in the definition of $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$ and γ is a trivialization of $\mathcal{E}$ over the formal neighborhood of y (this is indeed the global loop group $\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}$ of $\mathcal{G}$ introduced in [Zh2, §3.1]). Then $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\simeq\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}\overset{\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}}{\times}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$. Let us denote the base change along $[e]:\mathbb{A}^1\to\mathbb{A}^1$ by $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}\simeq\widetilde{\mathcal{L}\mathcal{G}}\overset{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}}}{\times}\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}$.

Let $\mathcal{F}_1$ and $\mathcal{F}_2$ be two objects in Sat_H. We can form the twisted product $(\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\tilde{\times}(\mathcal{F}_2)_{\mathbb{G}_m}$ over $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}\underset{\mathbb{G}_m}{\tilde{\times}}\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}$. We claim that there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}}((\mathcal{F}_1)_{\mathbb{G}_m}\tilde{\times}(\mathcal{F}_2)_{\mathbb{G}_m})\simeq\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)\tilde{\times}\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_2).$$

Indeed, let $V_i\subset\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}$ be closure of the support of $\mathcal{F}_i\boxtimes\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]$ in $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}|_{\mathbb{G}_m}$. Let $\mathcal{L}_n^+\mathcal{G}$ be the nth jet group such that the action of $\mathcal{L}^+\mathcal{G}$ on V_i factors through $\mathcal{L}_n^+\mathcal{G}$. The corresponding $\mathcal{L}_n^+\mathcal{G}$ torsor over $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$ is denoted by $\mathcal{L}_n\mathcal{G}$. Let us denote $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_n^+\mathcal{G}}$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_n\mathcal{G}}$ be their base changes along $[e]$. Then one can check the isomorphism after pullback along $\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_n\mathcal{G}}\times_{\mathbb{A}^1}V_2\to\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_n\mathcal{G}}\overset{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}_n^+\mathcal{G}}}{\times}V_2$, and the isomorphism follows from [G1, Theorem 5.2.1].

Now $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\to\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}},(y,\mathcal{E},\mathcal{E}',\beta,\beta)\mapsto(y,\mathcal{E}',\beta\beta')$ is ind-proper and taking nearby cycles commutes with proper push-forward. Therefore we obtain the canonical isomorphism

$$\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1\star\mathcal{F}_2)\simeq\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_1)\star\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}_2)$$

In addition, working over $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}\underset{\mathbb{A}^1}{\tilde{\times}}\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}$, one can see that this isomorphism makes $\mathcal{Z}$ a monoidal functor. □

Let us recall the definition of center functors as in [Be]. Namely, if $F:\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{D}$ is a monoidal functor between two monoidal categories and assume that $\mathcal{C}$ is a symmetric monoidal category, then F (together with the following data) is called central if

(1) there is an isomorphism c of the bi-functors $\mathcal{C}\times\mathcal{D}\to\mathcal{D}, (X,Y)\mapsto F(X)\otimes Y$ and $(X,Y)\mapsto Y\otimes F(X)$, i.e. an isomorphism $c_{X,Y}: F(X)\otimes Y\simeq Y\otimes F(X)$ functorial in X,Y;

(2) for $X,X'\in\mathcal{C}$, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F(X)\otimes F(X') \arrow[r, "c_{X,F(X')}"] \arrow[d] & F(X')\otimes F(X) \arrow[d] \\
F(X\otimes X') \arrow[r, "F(\sigma_{X,X'})"] & F(X'\otimes X),
\end{tikzcd}$$

where σ is the commutativity constraint of $\mathcal{C}$;

(3) for $X\in\mathcal{C}$ and $Y,Y'\in\mathcal{D}$, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F(X)\otimes Y\otimes Y' \arrow[r, "c_{X,Y}\otimes\mathrm{id}"] \arrow[d, "c_{X,Y\otimes Y'}"'] & Y\otimes F(X)\otimes Y' \arrow[d, "\mathrm{id}\otimes c_{X,Y'}"] \\
Y\otimes Y'\otimes F(X) \arrow[r, equal] & Y\otimes Y'\otimes F(X);
\end{tikzcd}$$

(4) for $X,X'\in\mathcal{C}, Y\in\mathcal{D}$, the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
F(X)\otimes F(X')\otimes Y \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}\otimes c_{X',Y}"] \arrow[d] & F(X)\otimes Y\otimes F(X') \arrow[r, "c_{X,Y}\otimes\mathrm{id}"] & Y\otimes F(X)\otimes F(X') \arrow[d] \\
F(X\otimes X')\otimes Y \arrow[r, "c_{X\otimes X',Y}"] & Y\otimes F(X\otimes X') \arrow[r, equal] & Y\otimes F(X\otimes X').
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proposition 3.2. *The functor $\mathcal{Z}$ is a central functor. Therefore, there is an algebraic group $\tilde{G}^\vee\subset H^\vee$ together with an equivalence $S:\mathcal{P}_v\simeq\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee)$ such that $S\circ\mathcal{Z}\simeq\mathrm{Res}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}_{H^\vee}$ as tensor functors, where $\mathrm{Res}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}_{H^\vee}$ is the restriction functor from $\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)$ to $\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee)$.*

Proof. Since every object in $\mathcal{P}_v$ appears as a direct summand of some object in the essential image of $\mathcal{Z}$, the second statement of the proposition is a direct consequence of the first statement and Proposition 1 of [Be].

The central property can be checked literally the same as in the [G2]. ☐

Now we would like to endow $\mathcal{P}_v$ with a fiber functor. We begin with the following general lemma.

Lemma 3.3. *Let $G_1\subset G_2$ be a closed embedding of affine algebraic groups over a field E (of characteristic zero). Let $F:\mathrm{Rep}(G_1)\to\mathrm{Vect}_E$ be an E-linear exact and faithful functor. Assume that: (i) $F(X\otimes Y)$ and $F(X)\otimes F(Y)$ are (non-canonically) isomorphic; (ii) $F\circ\mathrm{Res}^{G_1}_{G_2}$ is a fiber functor of $\mathrm{Rep}(G_2)$. Then F has a unique fiber functor structure which induces the fiber functor structure of $F\circ\mathrm{Res}^{G_1}_{G_2}$ as in (ii).*

Remark 3.1. I'm not sure whether the first assumption is necessary.

Proof. The uniqueness is clear. We write $R=\mathrm{Res}^{G_1}_{G_2}$ for simplicity. For any $X\in\mathrm{Rep}(G_2)$, let $\langle X\rangle$ denote the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}(G_2)$ consisting the objects that are isomorphic to subquotients of $X^n, n\in\mathbb{N}$, and $\langle R(X)\rangle$ denote the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Rep}(G_1)$ consisting of the objects that are isomorphic to subquotients of $R(X)^n, n\in\mathbb{N}$. Let us denote $\mathrm{End}(FR|_{\langle X\rangle})$ (resp. $\mathrm{End}(F|_{\langle R(X)\rangle})$) the endomorphism algebra of the restriction of the functor FR (resp. F) to $\langle X\rangle$ (resp. $\langle R(X)\rangle$). They are finite dimensional E-algebras and clearly, the E-algebra homomorphism $\mathrm{End}(F|_{\langle R(X)\rangle})\to\mathrm{End}(FR|_{\langle X\rangle})$ is injective. According to [DM], there are canonical equivalences and the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\langle X\rangle \arrow[r, "a_X", "\simeq"'] \arrow[d, "R"'] & \mathrm{End}(FR|_{\langle X\rangle})\mathrm{-Mod} \arrow[r, "\omega"] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Vect}_E \arrow[d, equal] \\
\langle R(X)\rangle \arrow[r, "b_{R(X)}", "\simeq"'] & \mathrm{End}(F|_{\langle R(X)\rangle})\mathrm{-Mod} \arrow[r, "\omega"] & \mathrm{Vect}_E
\end{tikzcd}.$$

In addition, $\omega a_X \simeq FR$ and $\omega b_{R(X)} \simeq F$. Let $A = \varinjlim_{X\in \mathrm{Rep}G_2}\mathrm{End}(FR|_{\langle X\rangle})^\vee$ and $B = \varinjlim_{X\in\mathrm{Rep}G_2}\mathrm{End}(F|_{\langle R(X)\rangle})^\vee$. we have the surjective map of coalgebras $A\to B$, and

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Rep}G_2 \arrow[r, "a", "\simeq"'] \arrow[d, "R"'] & A\text{-Comod} \arrow[r, "\omega"] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{Vect}_E \arrow[d, equal] \\
\mathrm{Rep}G_1 \arrow[r, "b", "\simeq"'] & B\text{-Comod} \arrow[r, "\omega"] & \mathrm{Vect}_E
\end{tikzcd}.$$

By the assumption (i) and [DM, Proposition 2.16], the tensor structures on $\mathrm{Rep}G_1$ and $\mathrm{Rep}G_2$ induces $B\otimes B\to B$ and $A\otimes A\to A$ respectively. Since the restriction functor R is a tensor functor, we have the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
A\otimes A \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & A \arrow[d] \\
B\otimes B \arrow[r] & B
\end{tikzcd}.$$

By assumption (ii), $\omega a\simeq FR$ is a fiber functor of $\mathrm{Rep}G_2$, and therefore we know that $A=\mathcal{O}_{G_2}$ and the map $A\otimes A\to A$ is the usual multiplication. Since the map $A\to B$ is surjective, this implies that the map $B\otimes B\to B$ is also associative and commutative. By [DM, Proposition 2.16] again, this implies that the functor F respect to the associativity and the commutativity constraints. The lemma follows. □

Corollary 3.4. *The functor taking the cohomology* $\mathrm{H}^*:\mathcal{P}_v\to\mathrm{Vect}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}$ *has a natural structure as a fiber functor.*

Proof. It is well-known that $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{F}_1\star\mathcal{F}_2)\simeq\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{F}_1)\otimes\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{F}_2)$. Since taking nearby cycles commutes with proper push forward, we have a canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{H}^*\circ\mathcal{Z}\simeq\mathrm{H}^*$. Since $\mathrm{H}^*:\mathrm{Sat}_H\to\mathrm{Vect}_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell}$ is a fiber functor. The assertion follows from the above lemma. □

4. Identification of the group $\tilde{G}^\vee$ with $(H^\vee)^I$

We need to describe this group $\tilde{G}^\vee$. To begin with, let us review how the geometrical Satake correspondence gives rise to a pinned group $(H^\vee,B_H^\vee,T_H^\vee,X^\vee)$. First, once we choose $T_H\subset B_H\subset H$, the construction of [MV] provides us $T_H^\vee\subset B_H^\vee\subset H^\vee$. Namely, let $U_H\subset B_H$ be its unipotent radical. For $\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)$, let S_μ be the semi-infinite orbit on Gr_H passing through s_μ as introduced in [MV] (i.e., the LU_H-orbit passing through s_μ. Let $S_{\leq\mu}=\cup_{\lambda\preceq\mu}S_\lambda$ and $S_{<\mu}=\cup_{\lambda\prec\mu}S_\lambda$. Then the fiber functor $H^*:\mathrm{Sat}_H\to\mathrm{Vect}_{\mathbb{Q}_\ell}$ has a canonical filtration (called the *MV filtration*) given by $\ker(H^*(\mathrm{Gr}_H,-)\to H^*(S_{<\mu},-))$. This defines a Borel $B_H^\vee\subset H^\vee$. In addition, it is proved that the filtration admits a canonical splitting, i.e. a canonical isomorphism $H^*(\mathrm{Gr}_H,-)\simeq\bigoplus_\mu H_c^*(S_\mu,-)$. This provides $T_H^\vee\subset B_H^\vee$. Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle on Gr_H, and let $c(\mathcal{L})\in H^2(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ be its Chern class. Then it is shown in [Gi, YZ] that the cup product with this class realize $c(\mathcal{L})$ as a principal nilpotent element in $X^\vee=\mathfrak{h}^\vee=\mathrm{Lie}H^\vee$. In addition, by [YZ, Proposition 5.6], the quadruple $(H^\vee,B_H^\vee,T_H^\vee,X^\vee)$ is indeed a pinned reductive group.

Remark 4.1. One remark is in order. In [YZ], all the assertions are proved for the affine Grassmannian defined over $\mathbb{C}$. The only place where the complex topology is used, besides the issue of dealing with $\mathbb{Z}$-coefficients as in [MV], is to define the coproduct on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ by realizing Gr_H homotopic to the based loop space of a maximal compact subgroup of $H_{\mathbb{C}}$. However, one can provide a commutative and cocommutative Hopf algebra structure on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ using the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian. More precisely, one can use the isomorphism (2.11) in *loc. cit.* to define the comultiplication map by the formula (2.12) in *loc. cit.*. This map on the other hand can be realized as follows. There is the Beilinson-Drinfeld Grassmannian $\pi : \mathrm{Gr}_2 \to \mathbb{A}^2$ whose fiber over a point in the diagonal $\Delta \subset \mathbb{A}^2$ is Gr_H and whose fiber over a point off the diagonal is $\mathrm{Gr}_H \times \mathrm{Gr}_H$ (cf. [MV, Sect. 5]). Then $R^i\pi_*\mathbb{Q}_\ell$ is a constructible sheaf on $\mathbb{A}^2$, constant along the stratification $\mathbb{A}^2 = \Delta \cup (\mathbb{A}^2 - \Delta)$. Now the usual cospecialization map of constructible sheaves gives rise to the comultiplication. From this latter definition, the usual arguments for the commutativity constraints as in [MV] show that this defined comultiplication is indeed cocommutative. The proof of [YZ, Lemma 5.1] that $c^{T_H}(\mathcal{L})$ is primitive under this Hopf algebra structure can be replaced by the following argument: as is well-known (e.g see [Zh1, 1.1.9]), if $\mathcal{L}$ is ample on Gr_H, then there is an ample line bundle on Gr_2 such that away from the diagonal it is $\mathcal{L} \boxtimes \mathcal{L}$ and on the diagram it is $\mathcal{L}$. All the remaining arguments of [YZ] apply to the situation Gr_H is defined over arbitrary field k and sheaves are $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ coefficients.

Remark 4.2. As explained in [MV, Theorem 3.6], the above pinning $(H^\vee, B_H^\vee, T_H^\vee, X^\vee)$ is in fact independent of the choice of $T \subset B$. Another way to deduce this fact is as follows. The natural grading on the cohomological functor H^* defines a one-parameter subgroup $\mathbb{G}_m \to H^\vee$ and $T_H^\vee$ is just the centralizer of this subgroup, which is independent of the choice of $T \subset B$. On the other hand, $B_H^\vee$ is completely determined by $X^\vee$, which is also independent of the choice of $T \subset B$. In other words, there is a canonical morphism from the Lefschetz SL_2 to $H^\vee$, which is a principal SL_2 in $H^\vee$, and the pinning is determined by this principal SL_2.

Recall that we denote ψ to be the action of I on Gr_H. The action of $\gamma \in I$ will map $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\lambda$ isomorphically to $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\gamma(\lambda)}$. Therefore $\gamma_* : D(\mathrm{Gr}_H) \to D(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ naturally gives rise to $\gamma_* : \mathrm{Sat}_H \to \mathrm{Sat}_H$ for $\gamma \in \Gamma$. In this way, I acts on Sat_H via tensor automorphisms. Under the geometrical Satake correspondence, I acts on $H^\vee$ clearly as pinned automorphisms with respect to the pinning we mentioned above.

Theorem 4.1. *$\tilde{G}^\vee \simeq (H^\vee)^I$.*

Remark 4.3. Observe that $(H^\vee)^I$ is not necessarily a connected reductive group. For example: let $H^\vee = \mathrm{GL}_{2n+1}$, let J be the matrix with $1s$ on the anti-diagonal and $0s$ elsewhere. Let $\Gamma = \{1, \gamma\}$ and γ acts on $H^\vee$ via $g \mapsto J(g^t)^{-1}J$. Then $(H^\vee)^I = \mathrm{O}_{2n+1}$.

Proof. Since $\mathcal{P}_v$ is semi-simple, $\tilde{G}^\vee$ is a reductive subgroup of $H^\vee$. We first see that $\tilde{G}^\vee \subset (H^\vee)^I$. The following lemma is a direct consequence of [DM, Corollary 2.9].

Lemma 4.2. *Let $f : H_2 \to H_1$ be a homomorphism of algebraic groups and let ω^f denote the induced tensor functor $\mathrm{Rep}(H_1) \to \mathrm{Rep}(H_2)$ (if f is a closed embedding then ω^f is the restriction functor $\mathrm{Res}_{H_1}^{H_2}$). Let $I \subset \mathrm{Aut}(H_1)$ so that it acts on $\mathrm{Rep}(H_1)$ via tensor automorphisms. If for any $\gamma \in I$, $\omega^f \circ \omega^\gamma \simeq \omega^f$, then f factors through $f : H_2 \to H_1^I \subset H_1$.*

Now, I acts on $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}} = \mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}} \times_{\mathbb{A}^1} \mathbb{A}^1$ via the action on the second factor $\mathbb{A}^1$ by deck transformations. By Lemma 2.1, we have

$$\mathcal{Z}(\gamma_*\mathcal{F}) = \Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}}(\gamma_*\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]) \simeq \Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}}((\psi(\gamma) \times \gamma)_*(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1])) \simeq \Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}}(\mathcal{F} \boxtimes \overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1]) = \mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}).$$

In other words, we have the tensor isomorphism between $\mathcal{Z} \circ \gamma_*$ and $\mathcal{Z}$ for all $\gamma \in I$. From the above lemma, $\tilde{G}^\vee \subset (H^\vee)^I$.

Therefore, we have successive restriction functors

$$\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)\to \mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)\to \mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee).$$

To prove that $\tilde{G}^\vee=(H^\vee)^I$, it is enough to show that the above restriction induces an isomorphism of K-groups $K(\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)^I)\simeq K(\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee))$. This is due to the fact that all groups involved are reductive.

As mentioned before, the group $(H^\vee)^I$ could be non-connected. Therefore, we need to be a little bit careful of $K(\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)^I)$. Let $(H^\vee)^{I,0}$ denote the neutral connected component of $(H^\vee)^I$. This is a connected reductive group with maximal torus $(T_H^\vee)^{I,0}$, the neutral connected component of $(T_H^\vee)^I$. The key fact is the following lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *The natural map*

$$(T^\vee)^I/(T^\vee)^{I,0}\to (H^\vee)^I/(H^\vee)^{I,0}$$

is an isomorphism.

Proof. Since we are working purely in the dual group side, let us switch the notation from $(H^\vee,B_H^\vee,T_H^\vee,X^\vee)$ to (H,B,T,X) in the proof. We will not distinguish a group from its $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ points. Let us choose γ to be a generator of I[2]. We need to show that $\pi_0(T^I)=\pi_0(H^I)$. Let N be the normalizer of T in H and let $W=N/T$ be the Weyl group. Then I acts on W naturally. Let us define a right action of W^I on $\mathrm{H}^1(I,T)$ as follows. Suppose w is in W^I and c be a cohomology class; lift w to $n\in N$ and lift c to a cocycle $\varphi:I\to T$. Then we set $(c\cdot w)(\gamma)=[n^{-1}\varphi(\gamma)\gamma(n)]$. It is clear that this is independent of all choices. We will deduce Lemma 4.3 from the following fact.

Lemma 4.4. *Under the above definition, every element $w\in W^I$ acts on $\mathrm{H}^1(I,T)$ via a group automorphism. In addition, $\mathrm{H}^1(I,H)$ is the quotient of $\mathrm{H}^1(I,T)$ via the above action.*

Proof. Observe that the map $N^I\to W^I$ is surjective. Indeed, let H_{der} be the derived group of H and H_{sc} be the simply-connected cover of H_{der}. We have corresponding groups $N_{\mathrm{der}},N_{\mathrm{sc}},T_{\mathrm{der}},T_{\mathrm{sc}}$. We now apply the argument of [St] p. 55 (5) to H_{sc} and γ. Our assumption that γ is pinned allows us to take $t=1$ in *loc. cit.*. This gives that the natural map $N_{\mathrm{sc}}^I\to W^I$ is surjective; therefore the same is true for $N^I\to W^I$ (another argument of this surjectivity can be found in [Bo, Lemma 6.2]). By taking the lift w to $n\in N^I$, it is clear that w acts on $\mathrm{H}^1(I,T)$ via group automorphisms. The second statement was proved in [PZ]. □

Remark 4.4. The above lemma in particular shows that if I acts on H via pinned automorphisms, then $\mathrm{H}^1(I,H)$ has a canonical abelian group structure. This does not necessarily hold for arbitrary action of I.

Corollary 4.5. *The preimage of $1\in \mathrm{H}^1(I,H)$ under $\mathrm{H}^1(I,T)\to\mathrm{H}^1(I,H)$ is 1.*

We continue to prove Lemma 4.3. First, if H is simply-connected, then H^I is connected as is show in [St, Theorem 8.2]. On the other hand, I acts on T via permuting a basis of $\mathbb{X}^\bullet(T)$. Therefore, T^I is also connected. The lemma holds in this case. For general H, let H_{der} be the derived group of H and H_{sc} be the simply-connected cover of H_{der}. Let T_{der} and T_{sc} be the corresponding preimages of T. Write

$$1\to Z\to H_{\mathrm{sc}}\to H_{\mathrm{der}}\to 1$$

which then gives

$$1\to\pi_0(H_{\mathrm{der}}^I)\to H^1(I,Z)\to H^1(I,H_{\mathrm{sc}}). \tag{4.1}$$

---

[2] In our case, the field extension $\tilde{F}/F$ is tame so that Galois group is cyclic and we can choose a generator. However, the lemma holds without this restriction. For general I, one can filtered I by cyclic subgroups and prove the lemma by induction. Simply observe that if $I_1\subset I$, then $(H^\vee)^{I_1,0}$ is also naturally pinned, on which I/I_1 acts via pinned automorphisms.

Similarly, the sequence of maximal tori

$$1 \to Z \to T_{\mathrm{sc}} \to T_{\mathrm{der}} \to 1$$

gives

$$1 \to \pi_0(T_{\mathrm{der}}^I) \to H^1(I, Z) \to H^1(I, T_{\mathrm{sc}}). \tag{4.2}$$

Comparing (4.1) and (4.2) and applying Corollary 4.5 give that the natural map

$$\pi_0(T_{\mathrm{der}}^I) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_0(H_{\mathrm{der}}^I) \tag{4.3}$$

is an isomorphism. Now consider

$$1 \to H_{\mathrm{der}} \to H \to D \to 1$$

which gives

$$1 \to \pi_0(H_{\mathrm{der}}^I) \to \pi_0(H^I) \to \pi_0(D^I) \to H^1(I, H_{\mathrm{der}}). \tag{4.4}$$

Similarly, the sequence of maximal tori

$$1 \to T_{\mathrm{der}} \to T \to D \to 1$$

give

$$1 \to \pi_0(T_{\mathrm{der}}^I) \to \pi_0(T^I) \to \pi_0(D^I) \to H^1(I, T_{\mathrm{der}}). \tag{4.5}$$

Comparing (4.4) and (4.5) and using Corollary 4.5 again give that the natural map

$$\pi_0(T^I) \xrightarrow{\sim} \pi_0(H^I) \tag{4.6}$$

is an isomorphism. □

Therefore, there exists the following "exact sequence" of representation rings

$$K(\mathrm{Rep}((T_H^\vee)^I/(T_H^\vee)^{I,0})) \to K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)) \to K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^{I,0})).$$

Here as usual, exact means that the second map is surjective and its kernel is identified with the augmented ideal of $K(\mathrm{Rep}((T_H^\vee)^I/(T_H^\vee)^{I,0}))$. We need to describe this sequence more explicitly.

Let $N_{(H^\vee)^I}((T_H^\vee)^I)$ (resp. $N_{(H^\vee)^{I,0}}((T_H^\vee)^{I,0})$) be the normalizer of $(T_H^\vee)^I$ (resp. $(T_H^\vee)^{I,0}$) in $(H^\vee)^I$ (resp. $(H^\vee)^{I,0}$). Let

$$W_0' = \frac{N_{(H^\vee)^{I,0}}((T_H^\vee)^{I,0})}{(T_H^\vee)^{I,0}} \simeq \frac{N_{(H^\vee)^I}((T_H^\vee)^I)}{(T_H^\vee)^I}$$

be the Weyl group of $((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0})$. From the above isomorphism, W_0' acts on $(T_H^\vee)^I$. By restriction a representation of $(H^\vee)^I$ to $(T_H^\vee)^I$, we obtain

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K(\mathrm{Rep}((T_H^\vee)^I/(T_H^\vee)^{I,0})) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\simeq"'] & K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^{I,0})) \arrow[d, "\simeq"] \\
\mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_{I,\mathrm{tor}}] \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I]^{W_0'} \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I/\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_{I,\mathrm{tor}}]^{W_0'}.
\end{tikzcd} \tag{4.7}$$

Since the first and the third vertical arrows are isomorphisms, so is the middle one.

The set of roots for $((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0})$, denoted by

$$\Phi((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0}) \subset \mathbb{X}^\bullet((T_H^\vee)^{I,0}) = \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I/\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_{I,\mathrm{tor}}$$

can be naturally lifted to a subset $\Phi((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0}) \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ (by considering the action of $(T_H^\vee)^I$ on $\mathrm{Lie}(H^\vee)^{I,0})$). They are just the images under $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T) \to \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ of the I-invariant roots $\Phi(H^\vee, T_H^\vee)^I$ for $(H^\vee, T_H^\vee)$. This set is isogenous (but not necessarily equal) the set of coroots $\Phi^\vee(G, A) \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(A) \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ for (G, A). More precisely, this means that for every $a^\vee \in \Phi((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0})$, a rational multiple of it belongs to $\Phi^\vee(G, A)$. Therefore, the Weyl group W_0' of $((H^\vee)^{I,0}, (T_H^\vee)^{I,0})$ coincides with the Weyl group W_0 of (G, A) (as subgroups in $\mathrm{Aut}(\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I)$). In other words, we can replace W_0' in (4.7) by W_0. We thus obtain the following

Lemma 4.6. *We have the following commutative diagram*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
K(\mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "\simeq"'] & K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I)) \arrow[d, "\simeq"] \\
\mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)]^W \arrow[r] & \mathbb{Z}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I]^{W_0},
\end{tikzcd}$$

Now we finish the proof of the theorem. For $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$, let $W_{\bar{\mu}}$ be the irreducible representation of $(H^\vee)^I$ of highest (with respect to the partial order "$\preceq$" on $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$) weight $\bar{\mu}$. By the standard argument, such representations exist and the multiplicity of the $\bar{\mu}$-weight in $W_{\bar{\mu}}$ is one. Because $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)^+ \simeq \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I/W_0$, these irreducible representations form a basis of $K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I))$. Let $\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)^+$ be a lift of $\bar{\mu}$. From the above observation, $\mathrm{Res}_{H^\vee}^{(H^\vee)^I}[V_\mu] = [W_{\bar{\mu}}] + \sum_{\bar{\lambda}\prec\bar{\mu}} c_{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}}[W_{\bar{\lambda}}]$, where [?] stands for the element in the K-group corresponding to ?. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{Res}_{H^\vee}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}[V_\mu] = \mathrm{Res}_{(H^\vee)^I}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}[W_{\bar{\mu}}] + \sum_{\bar{\lambda}\prec\bar{\mu}} c_{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}}\mathrm{Res}_{(H^\vee)^I}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}[W_{\bar{\lambda}}].$$

On the other hand, for $\bar{\mu} \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^+$, the intersection cohomology sheaf $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}} \in \mathcal{P}_v$ gives rise to an irreducible object $U_{\bar{\mu}}$ in $\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee)$. By Lemma 2.4, we have

$$\mathrm{Res}_{H^\vee}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}[V_\mu] = [U_{\bar{\mu}}] + \sum_{\bar{\lambda}\prec\bar{\mu}} d_{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}}[U_{\bar{\lambda}}].$$

By induction on $\bar{\mu}$, one immediately obtains that

$$\mathrm{Res}_{(H^\vee)^I}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}[W_{\bar{\mu}}] = U_{\bar{\mu}} + \sum_{\bar{\lambda}\prec\bar{\mu}} e_{\bar{\lambda}\bar{\mu}}[U_{\bar{\lambda}}].$$

Since $[W_{\bar{\mu}}]$ (resp. $[U_{\bar{\mu}}]$) form a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis of $K(\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I))$ (resp. $K(\mathrm{Rep}(\tilde{G}^\vee))$), this implies that $\mathrm{Res}_{(H^\vee)^I}^{\tilde{G}^\vee}$ is an isomorphism and therefore $\tilde{G}^\vee = (H^\vee)^I$. □

Remark 4.5. Although $(H^\vee)^I$ is not necessarily connected, in many aspect, it behaves like the connected reductive group due to Lemma 4.3. For example, we can talk about the root datum of $(H^\vee)^I$ (see the arguments before Lemma 4.6) and the pinning of $(H^\vee)^I$, and by the similar arguments before Lemma 4.6, a choice of pinning split the exact sequnce

$$1 \to \mathrm{Int}((H^\vee)^I) \to \mathrm{Aut}((H^\vee)^I) \to \mathrm{Out}((H^\vee)^I) \to 1.$$

In addition, we can identify $\mathrm{Out}((H^\vee)^I)$ with the group of automorphisms of the root datum. Another example is provided in Proposition 6.2.

Now, we switch to Theorem 0.2. Therefore, we will assume that G is a quasi-split reductive group defined over the non-archimedean local field $F = \mathbb{F}_q((t))$ (we can in fact replace $\mathbb{F}_q$ by any other perfect field). Let $k = \overline{\mathbb{F}}_q$, and σ be the Frobenius element in $\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$. Let $v \in \mathcal{B}(G, F)$ be a special vertex in the building which remains to be special when base change to $k((t))$. Let $\underline{G}_v$ be the special parahoric group scheme over $\mathbb{F}_q[[t]]$ corresponding to v and $K_v = L^+\underline{G}_v$. Then the affine flag variety $\mathcal{F}\ell_v = LG/K_v$ is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ and when base change to k, $\mathcal{F}\ell_v \otimes k$ is the affine flag variety considered in the previous sections, and we have the Tannakian category $\mathcal{P}_v = \mathcal{P}_{K_v\otimes k}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v \otimes k)$ with a fiber functor H^*.

As in Lemma A.3, there is an action of σ on $\mathcal{P}_v$, and therefore an action of σ on $(H^\vee)^I$. Following the notation as in the appendix, we denote this action by act^{geom}. On the other hand, since there is a canonical pinning $(H^\vee, B_H^\vee, T_H^\vee, X^\vee)$, there is a canonical action of $\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ on $H^\vee$ by pinned automorphisms and therefore an action of σ on $(H^\vee)^I$ by pinned automorphisms. We denote this action by act^{alg}. As in the Appendix, we denote cycl to be the cyclotomic character of $\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$, so that $\mathrm{cycl}(\sigma)=q^{1/2}$. Let $\chi=2\rho\circ\mathrm{cycle}:\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)\to(H^\vee)^I$ so that $\chi(\sigma)=q^\rho$. Again, since the action of act^{geom} on $(H^\vee)^I$ fixes the cohomological grading and acts on $X^\vee$ via the cyclotomic character, we know that

$$\mathrm{act}^{geom}=\mathrm{act}^{alg}\circ\mathrm{Ad}_\chi,$$

and there is an isomorphism

$$(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)\to(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{geom}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q),\quad (g,\sigma)\mapsto(\mathrm{Ad}_{q^{-\rho}}g,\sigma). \tag{4.8}$$

Now regarding $(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$ as a pro-algebraic group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$, as in the Appendix, we have the category $\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q))$ of algebraic representations of $(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$. Now Theorem 0.2 follows from the same line as in the Appendix.

Let $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$. By abuse of notation, we denote the corresponding Schubert variety in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v\otimes k$ by $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar\mu}\otimes k$. If $\bar\mu$ is defined $\mathbb{F}_q$, i.e. $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma$, then $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar\mu}\otimes k$ is also defined over $\mathbb{F}_q$ and we denote the corresponding Schubert variety in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ by $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar\mu}$. In this case the intersection cohomology sheaf $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar\mu}$ is naturally in $\mathcal{P}_v^0$, and $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar\mu})$ is a representation of $(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$. When restricted to $(H^\vee)^I$, it is the highest representation $W_{\bar\mu}$. By abuse of notation, this algebraic representation of $(H^\vee)^I\rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{geom}}\mathrm{Gal}(k/\mathbb{F}_q)$ is still denoted by $W_{\bar\mu}$.

5. IC-STALKS, q-ANALOGY OF THE WEIGHT MULTIPLICITY, AND THE LUSZTIG-KATO POLYNOMIAL

Let $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ and $\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{P}_v$. We determine the stalk cohomology $\mathcal{F}$ at the point $s_{\bar\mu}$. By abuse of notation, the inclusion map $s_{\bar\mu}\in\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is still denoted by $s_{\bar\mu}$. It will be convenient to define

$$\mathrm{Stalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F})=s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{F}[-(2\rho,\bar\mu)],\quad \mathrm{Costalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F})=s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{F}[(2\rho,\bar\mu)].$$

Let $X^\vee$ be the regular nilpotent element of $\mathrm{Lie}(H^\vee)^I$ given by the pinning. It defines an increasing filtration (the Brylinski-Kostant filtration) on any representation V of $H^\vee$ or $(H^\vee)^I$,

$$F_iV=(\ker X^\vee)^{i+1}. \tag{5.1}$$

If $\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ and denote $V(\bar\mu)$ to be the $\bar\mu$-weight subspace of V, under the action of $(T_H^\vee)^I$. Then filtration (5.1) induces

$$F_iV(\bar\mu)=V(\bar\mu)\cap F_iV. \tag{5.2}$$

Let

$$P_{\bar\mu}(V,q)=\sum\mathrm{gr}_i^F V(\bar\mu)q^i$$

be the q-analogue weight multiplicity polynomial.

Theorem 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{P}_v$ and let $V=\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{F})$ be the corresponding representation of $(H^\vee)^I$. Then*

$$P_{\bar\mu}(V,q)=\sum\dim\mathrm{H}^{-2i}(\mathrm{Stalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F}))q^i=\sum\dim\mathrm{H}^{2i}(\mathrm{Costalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F}))q^i.$$

Observe that by the parity vanishing property of $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathrm{Stalk}_{\bar\mu}\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathrm{Costalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F})$ only concentrate on even degrees.

In the split case, this is proved in [Lu, Bry]. A more geometrical proof is given by Ginzburg [Gi], which relies the geometrical Satake isomorphism and certain techniques of equivariant cohomology. We will follow Ginzburg's idea.

Let us give a quick review of equivariant cohomology. Let M be a variety with an action of a torus A. Let $\mathbb{B}A$ be the classifying space (stack) of A. Let $R_A=\mathrm{H}^*(\mathbb{B}A)$ and recall that $\mathrm{Spec}R_A\simeq\mathfrak{a}=\mathrm{Lie}A$. Let $t\in\mathfrak{a}$ be an element. We denote $\kappa(t)$ be the residue field of

t and let $\mathrm{H}_t := \mathrm{H}^*_A \otimes_{R_A} \kappa(t)$. Let t is a closed point. If $t = 0$, this functor H_0 inherits a canonical grading. For general t, this functor equips with a canonical filtration by

$$\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq i} := \mathrm{Im}(\sum_{j\leq i} \mathrm{H}^j_A \to \mathrm{H}_t),$$

and there is a canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{gr}^* \mathrm{H}_t \simeq \mathrm{H}^*_0$. For every $\mathcal{F} \in D_A(M)$, there is a spectral sequence $E_2^{p,q} = \mathrm{H}^p(\mathbb{B}A, H^q(M, \mathcal{F})) \Rightarrow \mathrm{H}^{p+q}_A(M, \mathcal{F})$. If this spectral sequence degenerates at the E_2-term (which is always the case in the following discussion), then $\mathrm{H}^*_0(M, \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}^*(M, \mathcal{F})$ and therefore we have a canonically isomorphism $\mathrm{gr}\,\mathrm{H}_t(M, \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Now assume that the action of A on M has only isolated fixed points M^A, and let $\eta \in \mathfrak{a}$ be the generic point. Then the localization theorem claims that there is an isomorphism

$$\bigoplus_{x\in M^A} \mathrm{H}_\eta(i_x^! \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}_\eta(M, \mathcal{F}) \simeq \bigoplus_{x\in M^A} \mathrm{H}_\eta(i_x^* \mathcal{F}), \tag{5.3}$$

where i_x is the inclusion of the point x.

Now consider $\mathrm{H}^*_{T_H} : \mathrm{Sat}_H \to R_{T_H}-\mathrm{Mod}$. It is proved in [YZ, Lemma 2.2] that there is a canonical grading preserving isomorphism

$$\mathrm{H}^*_{T_H} \simeq \mathrm{H}^* \otimes R_{T_H} : \mathrm{Sat}_H \to R_{T_H}-\mathrm{Mod}, \tag{5.4}$$

which endows $\mathrm{H}^*_{T_H}$ a structure of tensor functors and defines a canonically trivialized $H^\vee$-torsor $\mathcal{E} \simeq H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H$ on $\mathrm{Spec}R_{T_H} = \mathfrak{t}_H =: \mathrm{Lie}T_H$. In other words, the group scheme $\mathrm{Aut}^\otimes \mathrm{H}^*_{T_H}$ over $\mathfrak{t}_H$ of the tensor automorphism of this fiber functor, which a priori is an inner form of $H^\vee$, is canonically isomorphic to $H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H$. In addition, the MV filtration and its canonical splitting extend in the equivariant setting [YZ, Lemma 2.2] and provide $T^\vee_H \times \mathfrak{t}_H \subset B^\vee_H \times \mathfrak{t}_H \subset H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H$. Now, let $c^{T_H}(\mathcal{L}) \in \mathrm{H}^2_{T_H}(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ denote the equivariant Chern class of $\mathcal{L}$[3]. Then the action of $c^{T_H}(\mathcal{L})$ on $\mathrm{H}^*_{T_H}(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{F})$ for $\mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Sat}_H$ can be identified with the action of an element

$$e^{T_H} \in \Gamma(\mathfrak{t}_H, \mathrm{Lie}(\mathrm{ad}\mathcal{E})).$$

Since $\mathcal{E}$ is canonically trivialized, e^{T_H} can be regarded as a map $\mathfrak{t}_H \to \mathfrak{h}^\vee$. Observe that e^{T_H} is NOT the constant map $X^\vee$. In fact,

$$e^{T_H} = X^\vee + h,$$

where $h : \mathfrak{t}_H \to \mathfrak{t}^\vee_H \simeq (\mathfrak{t}_H)^*$ is given by a nondegenerate invariant bilinear form (cf. [YZ, Proposition 5.7]). In particular, $(H^\vee, B^\vee_H, T^\vee_H, e^{T_H})$ is not a pinning over $\mathfrak{t}_H$.

The equivariant homology $\mathrm{H}^{T_H}_*(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ is a commutative and cocommutative Hopf algebra and $J^\vee = \mathrm{Spec}\mathrm{H}^{T_H}_*(\mathrm{Gr}_H)$ is a flat group scheme over $\mathfrak{t}_H$, acting on every $\mathrm{H}^*_{T_H}(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F} \in \mathrm{Sat}_H$. By Tannakian formulism, this induces a map $\iota : J^\vee \to H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H$. In [YZ], it is shown that this is a closed embedding, which identifies $J^\vee$ with the $(H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H)^{e^{T_H}}$, the centralizer of e^{T_H} in $H^\vee \times \mathfrak{t}_H$.

Let η be the generic point of $\mathfrak{t}_H$. Then $J^\vee_\eta$ is indeed a torus in $H^\vee_\eta$ since $e^{T_H}(\eta) \in \mathfrak{h}^\vee_\eta$ is regular semisimple. Then localization theorem gives rise to an isomorphism of $J^\vee_\eta$-modules

$$\bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)} \mathrm{H}_\eta(s^!_\mu \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}_\eta(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{F}). \tag{5.5}$$

Following the idea of Ginzburg, we claim that this decomposition corresponds the weight decomposition under $J^\vee_\eta \subset H^\vee_\eta$. First, let $B^\vee_H \to T^\vee_H$ be the natural projection. As is shown in [YZ], $J^\vee \subset B^\vee_H \times \mathfrak{t}_H$ and the composition $J^\vee \to B^\vee_H \times \mathfrak{t}_H \to T^\vee_H \times \mathfrak{t}_H$ is identified with the map (cf. Remark 3.4 of *loc. cit.*)

$$R_{T_H}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)] \simeq \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)} \mathrm{H}^{T_H}_*(s_\mu) \to \mathrm{H}^{T_H}_*(\mathrm{Gr}_H).$$

---

[3] by replacing $\mathcal{L}$ be a power of it, we can assume that $\mathcal{L}$ is T_H-equivariant.

Over η, this is an isomorphism and therefore we obtain a canonical isomorphism $J_\eta^\vee \simeq (T_H^\vee)_\eta$. In addition, the action of $J_\eta^\vee$ on $\mathrm{H}_{\eta,c}(S_\mu, \mathcal{F})$ via $J_\eta^\vee \to (T_H^\vee)_\eta$ is identified with the natural action of $J_\eta^\vee$ on $\mathrm{H}_\eta(s_\mu^! \mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}_{\eta,c}(S_\mu, \mathcal{F})$. Therefore, we obtain the following proposition, originally proved by Ginzburg by another method.

Proposition 5.2. *Let $V \in \mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)$ and $\mathcal{S}(V) \in \mathrm{Sat}_H$ be the corresponding sheaf (see* (2.1)*). Under the identification of the weight lattice of $J_\eta^\vee$ with $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H^\vee)$ via the canonical isomorphism $J_\eta^\vee \to (T_H^\vee)_\eta$, the direct summand $\mathrm{H}_\eta(s_\mu^! \mathcal{S}(V)) \subset \mathrm{H}_\eta(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{S}(V))$ corresponds to the weight subspace $V(\mu) \subset V$ for $J_\eta^\vee$.*

Remark 5.1. Let us observe that the localization isomorphism (5.5) holds over $\mathfrak{t}_H$ after we remove all root hyperplanes. This is because for every T_H-invariant finite dimensional closed subvariety $Z \subset \mathrm{Gr}_H$, there are only finitely many 1-dimensional T_H-orbits in Z, and T_H acts on these orbits via rotations determined by roots. Therefore, in all the discussions above, we can replace the generic point η by any (closed) point in $\mathfrak{t}_H \setminus \{\tilde{a} = 0, \tilde{a} \in \Phi_H\}$, where Φ_H is the set of roots of H.

Now let t be a closed point on $\mathfrak{t}_H$ such that

$$h(t) = 2\rho \tag{5.6}$$

so that $e^{T_H}(t) = X^\vee + h(t) = X^\vee + 2\rho$. According to [YZ, Proposition 5.7], such point exists (unique up to adding an element in the center $\mathfrak{z}(\mathfrak{h})$ of $\mathfrak{h}$) and does not belong to any root hyperplanes. Therefore, the localization isomorphism (5.5) holds for H_t by the above remark. From now on, we will always choose the point t satisfying (5.6).

Recall that under the geometrical Satake isomorphism $\mathrm{H}^* : \mathrm{Sat}_H \simeq \mathrm{Rep}(H^\vee)$, the natural grading on the cohomology functor corresponds to the principal grading on representations of $H^\vee$. More precisely, consider the cocharacter $2\rho : \mathbb{G}_m \to T_H^\vee \subset H^\vee$. Then the grading on the cohomology functor corresponds to the grading given by 2ρ on the representations. This follows from the fact that $\mathrm{H}_c^*(S_\mu, \mathcal{F})$ is nonzero only in degree $(2\rho, \mu)$. Now it is clear from (5.4) that for the closed point $t \in \mathfrak{t}_H$, the filtration $\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq i}$ corresponds to the increasing filtration on the representations associated to the gradings given by 2ρ. For $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, let

$$\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)_i = \{\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H) \mid (2\rho, \mu) = i\}.$$

Let V be a representation of $H^\vee$. Denote

$$V(i) = \sum_{\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)_i} V(\mu),$$

where $V(\mu)$ is the μ-weight space of $J_t^\vee$. Let us identify $\mathrm{H}_t(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{S}(V))$ with V canonically, so that $\mathrm{H}_t(s_\mu^* \mathcal{S}(V))$ is identified with $V(\mu)$ by Proposition 5.2). Then we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5.3. *Let t be as in* (5.6)*. Write $\mathrm{H}_t = \mathrm{H}_t(\mathrm{Gr}_H, \mathcal{S}(V))$ for simplicity. Then for any $m \in \mathbb{Z}$,*

$$\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq 2i+m} \cap \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_m} \mathrm{H}_t(s_\mu^! \mathcal{S}(V)) = \mathrm{H}_t^{\leq 2i+1+m} \cap \bigoplus_{\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_m} \mathrm{H}_t(s_\mu^! \mathcal{S}(V)) = F_i V \cap V(m),$$

where $F_i V$ is defined as in (5.1)*.*

Proof. Let n be the unique element in $U_H^\vee$ such that $\mathrm{Ad}_n(X^\vee + 2\rho) = 2\rho$. Then the canonical isomorphism $J_t^\vee \simeq T_H^\vee$ is given by $\mathrm{Ad}_n : J_t^\vee \to T_H^\vee$. The proposition clearly follows from the following purely representation theoretical lemma. □

Lemma 5.4. *Let V be a representation of $H^\vee$. Let*

$$V = \sum V^1(i), \quad V = \sum V^2(i)$$

be two gradings on V, given by the cocharacters $2\rho : \mathbb{G}_m \to H^\vee$ and $\mathrm{Ad}_{n^{-1}}2\rho : \mathbb{G}_m \to H^\vee$ respectively. Let $F^1_\bullet V$ and $F^2_\bullet V$ be two filtrations on V given by

$$F^1_i V = \sum_{j\leq i} V^1(j), \quad F^2_i V = (\ker X^\vee)^{i+1}.$$

The for any $m\in\mathbb{Z}$, $V^2(m)\cap F^1_{2i+m}V = V^2(m)\cap F^1_{2i+1+m}V = V^2(m)\cap F^2_i V$.

Proof. Let $Y^\vee\in\mathfrak{h}^\vee$ so that $\{X^\vee, 2\rho, Y^\vee\}$ form an $\mathfrak{sl}_2$-triple. Then the lemma is purely a statement about this $\mathfrak{sl}_2$ and can be checked easily by direct calculation. □

This finishes the discussion for split groups. Now let G be as before and A be its maximal split torus. By the isomorphism (1.1), we can regard A as a subtorus of T_H. Note that we can restrict everything discussed above to $A\subset T_H$. In particular, we can choose the point $t\in\mathfrak{a}$ such that $h(t) = 2\rho$. This is because that $h : \mathfrak{t}_H \to \mathfrak{t}_H^\vee$ is equivariant under the automorphisms of the based root datum and 2ρ is a fixed point under these automorphisms.

We begin to prove the theorem. Observe that it is enough to prove the theorem for objects in $\mathcal{P}_v$ of the form $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{F}\in\mathrm{Sat}_H$. Indeed, both maps $\mathcal{P}_v\to\mathbb{Z}[q]$ given by $\mathcal{F}\mapsto P_{\bar\mu}(\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}), q)$ and $\mathcal{F}\mapsto\sum\dim\mathrm{H}^{2i}(\mathrm{Costalk}_{\bar\mu}(\mathcal{F}))q^i$ factor through the Grothendieck group, and as observed in the proof of Theorem 0.1 in Sect. 4, the objects of the form $\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}), \mathcal{F}\in\mathrm{Sat}_H$ generate the Grothendieck group of $\mathcal{P}_v$.

Recall that the maximal torus $A\subset G$ extends naturally to a split torus over $\mathcal{O}$ and $A_{\mathcal{O}}\subset \underline{G}_v$. Therefore, we can regard A as a subtorus of K_v, via $A\subset L^+A_{\mathcal{O}}\subset L^+\underline{G}_v = K_v$. The set of fixed points of the action of A on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ are exactly $\{s_{\bar\mu}|\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I\}$. We consider the A-equivariant cohomology $\mathrm{H}^*_A : \mathcal{P}_v\to R_A-\mathrm{Mod}$. Since the nearby cycle functor commutes with proper base change, we have a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathrm{H}^*_A\circ\mathcal{Z}\simeq\mathrm{H}^*_A : \mathrm{Sat}_H\to R_A-\mathrm{Mod}.$$

Indeed, when fixing a cohomological degree, we can we replace $\mathbb{B}A$ by $(\mathbb{P}^n)^{\mathrm{rk}\,A}$ for n large enough, and consider the nearby cycle functors for the family $\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}\times^A(\mathbb{P}^n)^{\mathrm{rk}\,A}$. The claim then is clear.

Remark 5.2. One should be able to argue as defining the tensor structure of H^*, that there is a canonical isomorphism

$$\mathrm{H}^*_A\simeq\mathrm{H}^*\otimes R_A : \mathcal{P}_v\to R_A-\mathrm{Mod},$$

which endows H^*_A a fiber functor structure, and the corresponding $(H^\vee)^I$ torsor on $\mathrm{Spec}R_A = \mathfrak{a} =: \mathrm{Lie}A$ is canonically trivialized. However, we did not investigate this.

Let $p : \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)\to\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ the projection. Let η be the generic point of $\mathfrak{a}$.

Lemma 5.5. *Under the canonical isomorphism $\mathrm{H}_\eta(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))\simeq\mathrm{H}_\eta(\mathrm{Gr}_H,\mathcal{F})$, the direct summand $\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(s^!_{\bar\mu}\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))$ corresponds to $\bigoplus_{\mu\in p^{-1}(\bar\mu)}\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(s^!_\mu\mathcal{F})$. Therefore, by Proposition 5.2, if $\mathcal{F}=\mathcal{S}(V)$, this direct summand can be further identified with $\bigoplus_{\mu\in p^{-1}(\bar\mu)}V(\mu)$, the weight subspaces under $J^\vee_\eta$.*

Proof. Recall that if $f:\mathcal{X}\to\mathcal{Y}$ is a morphism of varieties over $\mathbb{A}^1$, then there are always the natural maps $f^*\Psi_{\mathcal{Y}}\to\Psi_{\mathcal{X}}f^*$ and $\Psi_{\mathcal{Y}}f_*\to f_*\Psi_{\mathcal{X}}$ (see SGA 7 Exposé XIII, (2.1.7.1) (2.1.7.2)). In addition, these two maps fit into the following diagram is commutative

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\Psi_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{F}) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & f_*f^*\Psi_{\mathcal{Y}}(\mathcal{F}) \arrow[d] \\
\Psi_{\mathcal{Y}}(f_*f^*\mathcal{F}) \arrow[r] & f_*\Psi_{\mathcal{X}}(f^*\mathcal{F}).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Now let $\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T_H)$ and apply this remark to $s_\mu:\mathbb{A}^1\to\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}}_{\mathcal{G}}$ as defined in the proof of Lemma 2.4. By taking the cohomology H^*_A, we obtain, for any $\mathcal{F}\in\mathrm{Sat}_H$, the following commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathrm{Gr}_H,\mathcal{F}) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})) \arrow[r] \arrow[d] & \mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})) \arrow[d] \\
\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_\mu^*\mathcal{F}) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & \mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\Psi_{\widetilde{\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathcal{G}}}}(s_{\mu *}s_\mu^*\mathcal{F})) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & \mathrm{H}^*_A(\Psi_{\mathbb{A}^1}(s_\mu^*\mathcal{F}))
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.7}$$

In other words, the composition $\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathrm{Gr}_H,\mathcal{F})\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_\mu^*\mathcal{F})$ factors as $\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_\mu^*\mathcal{F})$. On the other hand, by localization theorem, over the generic η of $\mathfrak{a}$, we have

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F}))) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] \arrow[d, "\simeq"'] & \bigoplus_{\bar\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I}\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{F})) \arrow[d, "\simeq"] \\
\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(\mathrm{Gr}_H,\mathcal{Z}) \arrow[r, "\simeq"] & \bigoplus_{\mu\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)}\mathrm{H}^*_\eta(s_\mu^*\mathcal{F})
\end{tikzcd} \tag{5.8}$$

Observe that in the localization theorem (5.3), for $x,y\in M^A$ and $x\neq y$, the composition $\mathrm{H}_\eta(i_x^!\mathcal{F})\to\mathrm{H}_\eta(i_y^*\mathcal{F})$ is zero. Therefore, the lemma follows from (5.7) and (5.8). ☐

Now by Proposition 5.3,

$$\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq 2i+(2\rho,\bar\mu))}\cap\mathrm{H}_t(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V)))=\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq 2i+1+(2\rho,\bar\mu))}\cap\mathrm{H}_t(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V)))=F_iV\cap\bigoplus_{\mu\in p^{-1}(\bar\mu)}V(\mu),$$

where we write $\mathrm{H}_t=\mathrm{H}_t(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V)))$ for brevity. Therefore, to finish the prove of the theorem, it remains to show that

Lemma 5.6. *Let $\mathcal{F}\in\mathcal{P}_v$. Then the canonical map*

$$\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{F})\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}) \tag{5.9}$$

is a splitting injective map of free R_A-modules. Therefore,

$$\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq i}(\mathcal{F}\ell_v,\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V)))\cap\mathrm{H}_t(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V)))=\mathrm{H}_t^{\leq i}(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{Z}(\mathcal{S}(V))).$$

These are general facts about flag varieties for Kac-Moody groups. The basic geometric fact behind this proposition is that the "big open cell" of the flag variety contracts to a point under certain $\mathbb{G}_m$-action. Then the statement follows from the weight reasons (cf. [Gi]). We here reproduce the proof for completeness.

Proof. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $\mathcal{F}$ is an intersection cohomology complex. First, we claim that it is enough to prove a dual statement: the map

$$\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F})\to\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{F}) \tag{5.10}$$

is surjective. To see this, recall that since each of $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F}),s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{F},s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{F}$ concentrates in cohomological degrees of the same parity, the spectral sequence calculating the A-equivariant cohomology degenerates at the E_2-term, which implies that all $\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F})$, $\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{F})$, $\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{F})$ are finite free R_A-modules. Then taking $\mathrm{Hom}(-,R_A)$ interchanges (5.9) and (5.10).

Since $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ is the flag variety of certain Kac-Moody group (cf. [PR1, Sect. 9.h]), for every $s_{\bar\mu}$, there is a $\mathbb{G}_m$-action on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, contracting an open neighborhood of $s_{\bar\mu}$ in $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$ to $s_{\bar\mu}$. In addition, this $\mathbb{G}_m$-action stabilizes every Schubert cell $\mathring{\mathcal{F}\ell}{}^s_{\bar\lambda}$, and commutes with the action of A on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$. Denote this open neighborhood by $j:U_{\bar\mu}\hookrightarrow\mathcal{F}\ell_v$. Then $U_{\bar\mu}$ is an inductive limit of affine spaces. Indeed, $U_{\bar 0}$ is just the big open cell in the flag variety, and $U_{\bar\mu}$ is the translate $U_{\bar 0}$ via $s_{\bar\mu}$ (lifted to an element in $T(F)$).

Now we can assume that our group is defined over $\mathbb{F}_q((t))$ and splits over a totally ramified extension. All the discussion above remains unchanged in this setting. Recall that we denote $\mathcal{P}_v^0$ to be the K_w-equivariant perverse sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, pure of weight zero. It is well-known that for every object $\mathcal{F}$ in $\mathcal{P}_v$, $\mathrm{H}^*_A(s_{\bar\mu}^*\mathcal{F})$ is pure of weight zero (i.e. $\mathrm{H}^i_A(s_{\bar\mu}^!\mathcal{F})$ is pure of weight

i), essentially due to the existence of Demazure resolutions. To show (5.10) is surjective, We decompose this map into

$$\mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{H}^*_A(U_{\bar{\mu}}, j^*\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{H}^*_A(s^*_{\bar{\mu}}\mathcal{F}).$$

It is well-known that the second map is an isomorphism since $j^*\mathcal{F}$ is equivariant under this $\mathbb{G}_m$-action, which contracts $(U_{\bar{\mu}} \cap \operatorname{Supp}\mathcal{F})$ to $s_{\bar{\mu}}$. In particular, $\mathrm{H}^*_A(U_{\bar{\mu}}, j^*\mathcal{F})$ is pure of weight zero. Therefore, it is enough to show that the first map is surjective. Denote $i : Z = \mathcal{F}\ell_v \setminus U_{\bar{\mu}} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{F}\ell_v$ to be the complement. Then we have the distinguished triangle

$$i_*i^!\mathcal{F} \to \mathcal{F} \to j_*j^*\mathcal{F} \to$$

and therefore

$$0 \to \mathrm{H}^*_A(i^!\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{H}^*_A(\mathcal{F}) \to \mathrm{H}^*_A(U_{\bar{\mu}}, j^*\mathcal{F}) \to 0.$$

The last map is surjective because the weights of $\mathrm{H}^*_A(i^!\mathcal{F})$ are ≥ 0. □

6. The Langlands parameter

In this section, we briefly discuss the Langlands parameters for smooth "unramified" representations of a quasi-split p-adic group. The parameters themselves can be described easily, and they will be used when we discuss the Frobenius trace of nearby cycles for certain unitary Shimura varieties.

We will assume that F is a non-archimedean local field and G is a quasi-split connected reductive group over F. Following the notation in the previous sections, we denote $H^\vee$ to be its dual group in the sense of Langlands defined over $\mathbb{C}$, i.e. the root datum is dual to the root datum of G.

We call an irreducible smooth representation V of G "unramified", if there is some $v \in V, v \neq 0$, which is fixed by some special parahoric subgroup of G. Note that even the group G itself is ramified, there are "unramified" representations.

Remark 6.1. Again, one could try to define "unramified" representations of G as those with a vector fixed by some special maximal compact subgroup of G. However, from the point of view of Langlands parameters, this is not correct.

If the group G is unramified, the description the Langlands parameters are well-known (for example, see [Bo, Chapter II]). Let us write of the Langlands parameters of "unramified" representations for quasi-split ramified groups.

Recall that in Sect. 4, we provide $H^\vee$ a canonical pinning $(H^\vee, B^\vee, T^\vee, X^\vee)$ using the geometrical Satake correspondence. Then $\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ acts on $H^\vee$ via pinned automorphisms, which we denote to be act^{alg}, and we can form the Langlands dual group of G as

$${}^LG^{alg} = H^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F).$$

Let W_F be the Weil group of F. A Langlands parameter is a continuous homomorphism (up to conjugation by $H^\vee$)

$$\rho : W_F \to {}^LG = H^\vee \rtimes \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F),$$

such that its composition with the canonical projection ${}^LG^{alg} \to \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ is the natural inclusion $W_F \to \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ and $\rho(W_F)$ consists of semisimple elements of ${}^LG$. (see [Bo, 8.2] for the unexplained terminology).

We write $\rho(\gamma) = (\rho_1(\gamma), \gamma)$ for $\gamma \in W_F$, where ρ_1 is a map from W_F to $H^\vee$.

Definition 6.1. An "unramified" parameter is a Langlands parameter ρ which can be conjugate to the form $\rho(\gamma) = (1, \gamma)$ for γ in the inertial group I.

Let $(H^\vee)^I$ be the I-fixed point subgroup of $H^\vee$ (which could be non-connected according to Remark 4.3). Then $\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)/I$ acts on $(H^\vee)^I$ through a finite cyclic group $\langle\sigma\rangle$, where $\sigma \in \mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)/I$ is the Frobenius element.

Lemma 6.1. *"Unramified" Langlands parameters $\rho : W_F \to {}^LG^{alg}$ are one-to-one correspondent to semi-simple elements in $(H^\vee)^I \times \sigma \subset (H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \langle\sigma\rangle$ up to conjugacy by $(H^\vee)^I$.*

We denote the set of semi-simple elements in $(H^\vee)^I \times \sigma$ by $((H^\vee)^I \times \sigma)_{ss}$.

Proof. Let Φ be a lift of the Frobenius element to W_F. Then ρ is uniquely determined by $\rho_1(\Phi)$, which is a semi-simple element in $H^\vee$. Let $\gamma \in I$. Then $(1, \Phi\gamma\Phi^{-1}) = \rho(\Phi\gamma\Phi^{-1}) = (\rho_1(\Phi), \Phi)(1,\gamma)(\rho_1(\Phi^{-1}), \Phi^{-1})$ implies that $\rho_1(\Phi)$ is invariant under I. Conversely, if $g \in H^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} I$. Then the formulas $\rho_1(I) = 1, \rho_1(\Phi) = g$ define ρ.

Finally, elements $h \in H^\vee$ satisfies that $(h,1)(1,\gamma)(h^{-1},1) = (1,\gamma)$ for all $\gamma \in I$ if and only if $h \in (H^\vee)^I$. □

Now let $v \in \mathcal{B}(G)$ be a special vertex and $K_v \subset G(F)$ be a special parahoric subgroup of $G(F)$. Let A be a maximal F-split torus such that v is contained in the apartment associated to A and let T be the centralizer of A, which is a maximal torus of G. As mentioned in the Introduction, in this case (0.1) can be written more explicitly as

$$C_c(K_v \setminus G(F)/K_v) \simeq \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma]^{W_0}.$$

We identify W_0 with the σ invariants of the Weyl group $W((H^\vee)^I, (T^\vee)^I)$ (which was denoted by W_0 in Sect. 4), and let N_0 be the inverse image of W_0 inside the normalizer of $(T^\vee)^I$ in $(H^\vee)^I$. Let $\mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \langle\sigma\rangle)$ be category of algebraic representations of $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \langle\sigma\rangle$.

For every $W \in \mathrm{Rep}((H^\vee)^I \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \langle\sigma\rangle)$, by restriction of its character to $(H^\vee)^I \times \sigma$, we obtain a function on $(H^\vee)^I \times \sigma$. We denote the algebra of functions on $(H^\vee)^I \times \sigma$, generated by these restrictions of characters by K. As in Remark 4.5, we can adapt the proofs in [Bo, 6.4-6.7] to the group $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes \langle\sigma\rangle$, and obtain

Proposition 6.2. *(i) The natural map $\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma \subset \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I$ induces an isomorphism*

$$\alpha : (T^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma / \operatorname{Int} N_0 \simeq \mathrm{Spec}\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma]^{W_0}.$$

(ii) The natural map $(T^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma \to (H^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma$ induces an isomorphism

$$\beta : (T^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma / \operatorname{Int} N_0 \simeq ((H^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma)_{ss} / \operatorname{Int}(H^\vee)^I.$$

(iii) The composition $\beta\alpha^{-1} : \mathrm{Spec}\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma]^{W_0} \to ((H^\vee)^I \times \sigma)_{ss} / \operatorname{Int}(H^\vee)^I$ induces an isomorphism

$$\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma]^{W_0} \simeq K$$

as functions on $((H^\vee)^I \times \sigma)_{ss} / \operatorname{Int}(H^\vee)^I$.

Now if π is an "unramified" representation of $G(F)$ such that $\pi^{K_v} \neq 0$. Then it is one-dimensional and $C_c(K_v \setminus G(F)/K_v)$ acts on it through some character χ_π, which can be identified with an $\operatorname{Int}(H^\vee)^I$-orbit on the semi-simple elements in $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes \sigma$.

Definition 6.2. We define the unramified parameter associated to π to be the unique Langlands parameter

$$\mathrm{Sat}(\pi) : W_F \to {}^LG$$

corresponding to χ_π under the above identifications.

Now, assume that $F = \mathbb{F}_q(\!(t)\!)$ is equal characteristic, and we are in the geometrical setting. Let $\bar\mu \in \mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)_I^\sigma$, so that $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar\mu}$ is a perverse sheaf on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, pure of weight zero (see Sect. 4). Let $A_{\bar\mu} \in C_c(K_v \setminus G(F)/K_v)$ be the associated function under the Grothendieck's sheaf-function dictionary. As in the unramified case (see Lemma A.9), we have the following identity as a consequence of the above discussions.

$$\mathrm{tr}(\pi(A_\mu)) = \mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{Sat}(\pi)(\Phi), W_{\bar\mu}), \tag{6.1}$$

where we assume (after conjugation) that $\mathrm{Sat}(\pi)(\Phi) \in ((H^\vee)^I \times \sigma)_{ss}$, and $W_{\bar\mu}$ is the representation of $(H^\vee)^I \rtimes \langle\sigma\rangle$ attached to $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar\mu}$ at the end of Sect. 4.

7. Applications to the nearby cycles on certain Shimura varieties

One of the main motivations of this work is to calculate the nearby cycle functors for certain unitary Shimura varieties. This is achieved by the so-called Rapoport-Zink-Pappas local models.

Let $F/\mathbb{Q}$ be a quadratic imaginary field we fix an embedding $F \subset \mathbb{C}$. Let (W, ϕ) be a hermitian space over $F/\mathbb{Q}$, of dimension $n = \dim W \geq 3$. Let $G = \mathrm{GU}(W, \phi)$ be the group of unitary similitude defined by

$$G(R) = \{g \in \mathrm{GL}_F(W \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} R) \mid \phi(gv, gw) = c(g)\phi(v, w), c(g) \in R^\times\}.$$

Assume that $(W_{\mathbb{R}}, \phi_{\mathbb{R}}) \simeq (\mathbb{C}^n, H)$, where H is the standard Hermitian matrix on $\mathbb{C}^n$ of signature (r, s), i.e. $H = \mathrm{diag}\{(-1)^{(s)}, 1^{(r)}\}$ is the diagonal matrix with -1 repeated at the first s places and 1 repeated at the remaining r places[4]. Without loss of generality, we can assume that $s \leq r$. Let $h : \mathrm{Res}_{\mathbb{C}/\mathbb{R}}\mathbb{G}_m \to G_{\mathbb{R}}$ be the homomorphism given by $h(z) = \mathrm{diag}\{z^{(s)}, \bar{z}^{(r)}\}$. Let $K \subset G(\mathbb{A}_f)$ be an open compact subgroup, small enough (i.e. K is contained in some principal congruent subgroup for some $N \geq 3$). Then associated to the data $(G, \{h\}, K)$, one can define a Shimura variety $Sh(G, K)$ over a number field E, where $E = \mathbb{Q}$ if $r = s$, and $E = F$ if $r \neq s$. Let us also recall that h also determine a conjugacy class of one parameter subgroup of $G_{\mathbb{C}}$ (the Shimura cocharacter), defined over E. In our case, $G_{\mathbb{C}} \simeq \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m$ and the one parameter subgroup is conjugate to $\mu_{r,s}(z) = (\mathrm{diag}\{z^{(s)}, 1^{(r)}\}, z)$.

Let us fix a prime $p > 2$ and assume that $F/\mathbb{Q}$ is ramfied at p. We denote F_p (resp. E_p) the completion of F (resp. E) at the unique place over p. In addition, we assume that (W, ϕ) is a split hermitian form at p. In other words, $(W, \phi)_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \simeq (F_p^n, J)$, where J is the split hermitian matrix on F_p^n with all its anti-diagonal entries 1, and 0 elsewhere. We will assume that $K = K_pK^p \subset G(\mathbb{Q}_p)G(\mathbb{A}_f^p)$ and K_p is a special parahoric of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. Let us make it more concretely.

Let π be a uniformizer of F_p so that $\pi^2 = p$. Let $\{e_1, \ldots, e_n\}$ be a basis of F_p^n so that $\phi(e_i, e_j)$ is given by J. Let

$$\Lambda_i = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathcal{O}_{F_p}}\{\pi^{-1}e_1, \cdots, \pi^{-1}e_i, e_{i+1}, \cdots, e_n\}.$$

If $n = 2m + 1$, we consider two integral models for $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$,

$$\underline{G}_{v_0} = \{g \in G, g\Lambda_0 = \Lambda_0\}, \quad \underline{G}_{v_1} = \{g \in G, g\Lambda_m = \Lambda_m\}. \tag{7.1}$$

If $n = 2m$, we consider the integral model

$$\underline{G}_v = \{g \in G, g\Lambda_m = \Lambda_m\}. \tag{7.2}$$

As explained in [PR2, Sect. 1.2], these $\underline{G}_v$ are special parahoric group schemes and essentially all special parahoric group schemes of G are of these forms.

Let $K_p = \underline{G}_v(\mathcal{O}_{F_p})$. In this case, the Shimura variety $Sh(G, K)$ has a well-defined model over $\mathcal{O}_{E_p}$, as in [PR2]. Let us denote the integral model by Sh_{K_p}. In addition, there is the so-called local model diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
 & \widetilde{Sh}_{K_p} \arrow[dl, "\pi"'] \arrow[dr, "\varphi"] & & , \\
Sh_{K_p} & & \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p} &
\end{tikzcd}$$

where the scheme $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$, which is called the local model of Sh_{K_p}, is projective over $\mathcal{O}_{E_p}$ with an action of $\underline{G}_v \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O}_{E_p}$, and is étale locally isomorphic to Sh_{K_p}. In addition, π :

---

[4] The corresponding hermitian form is $H(z, w) = \underline{\bar{z}}^t H \underline{w}$ for $\underline{z}, \underline{w} \in \mathbb{C}^n$.

$\widetilde{Sh}_{K_p} \to Sh_{K_p}$ is a $\underline{G}_v \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O}_{E_p}$-torsor, and $\varphi : \widetilde{Sh}_{K_p} \to \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$ is $\underline{G}_v \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}_p} \mathcal{O}_{E_p}$-equivariant and is formally smooth. (cf. [PR2] for details).

We are interested in the nearby cycle $\Psi_{Sh_{K_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$, which is an ℓ-adic complex on $Sh_{K_p} \otimes_{\mathcal{O}_{E_p}} \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$, on which $\Gamma = \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/E)$ acts continuously, compatible with the action of Γ on $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p} \otimes \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ through the $\Gamma \to \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p/\mathbb{F}_p)$. According to the local model diagram, we have

$$\pi^* \Psi_{Sh_{K_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell) \simeq \varphi^* \Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell).$$

Therefore, it is essentially to determine $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)$. For this purpose, we need to recall the geometry of $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$.

First, let $F' = \mathbb{F}_p((u))$ be a ramified quadratic extension of $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$ with $u^2 = t$. Let $W' = F'e_1 + \cdots + F'e_n$ and ϕ' be a split hermitian form on W' given by $\phi'(e_i, e_{n+1-j}) = \delta_{ij}$. Let G' be the corresponding unitary similitude group over $\mathbb{F}_p((t))$. The parahoric group scheme $\underline{G}_v$ of G over $\mathbb{Z}_p$ has an obvious counterpart $\underline{G}'_v$ over $\mathbb{F}_p[[t]]$. Namely, consider

$$\Lambda'_i = \mathrm{Span}_{\mathcal{O}_{F'}}\{\pi^{-1}e_1, \cdots, \pi^{-1}e_i, e_{i+1}, \cdots, e_n\}.$$

If $\underline{G}_v = G_{\mathbb{Q}_p} \cap \mathrm{Aut}(\Lambda_i)$, then $\underline{G}'_v = G' \cap \mathrm{Aut}(\Lambda'_i)$. Observe that there is an isomorphism $\underline{G}_v \otimes \mathbb{F}_p \simeq \underline{G}'_v \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ (given by the obvious identification of $(W, \phi)_{\mathbb{F}_p} \simeq (W', \phi')_{\mathbb{F}_p}$). In addition, the Shimura cocharacter $\mu_{r,s}$ makes sense as a cocharacter of $G' \otimes (\mathbb{F}_p((t)))^s$. Let $\mathcal{F}\ell_v = LG'/L^+\underline{G}'_v$ be the associated affine flag variety considered before.

Now, we give the description of $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$. The following statements can be extracted from [PR2, Ri, PZ].

Proposition 7.1. *(i) The generic fiber of* $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$ *is isomorphic to* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}}$*, where* $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}}$ *is the variety of maximal parabolic subgroups of* G_{E_p} *of the type given by* $\mu_{r,s}$*.*

(ii) The special fiber is isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ *in an equivariant way. More precisely, the* $L^+\underline{G}'_v$*-action on* $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ *factors through an action of* $\underline{G}'_v \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$*, and there is an isomorphism*

$$\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p} \simeq \mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}_{r,s}},$$

intertwining the $\underline{G}_v \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ *action on the left and this* $\underline{G}'_v \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$*-action on the right.*

(iii) The generic point of the special fiber $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p} \otimes \mathbb{F}_p$ *is smooth in* $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$*.*

Having described the geometry of $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$, let us state the main theorem of this section. First, let $\mathcal{P}_v$ be either

1. the category of $L^+\underline{G}'_v$-equivariant Weil perverse sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$, constant along each $L^+\underline{G}'_v$-orbit; or
2. the category of $L^+\underline{G}'_v \otimes \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$-equivariant perverse sheaves on $\mathcal{F}\ell_v \otimes \overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$.

Likewise, we understand $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ either as a pure perverse sheaf of weight zero, or just a geometrical perverse sheaf. By Theorem 0.1, we have:

1. if $n = 2m+1$ is odd,
$$\mathcal{RS} : \mathrm{Rep}(\mathrm{GO}_{2m+1}) \simeq \mathcal{P}_v;$$
2. if $n = 2m$ is even,
$$\mathcal{RS} : \mathrm{Rep}(\mathrm{GSp}_{2m}) \simeq \mathcal{P}_v.$$

Next, let V be the standard representation of GL_n and $V_{r,s} = \wedge^s V$ to be its sth wedge power. We extend $V_{r,s}$ to a representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m$, on which $\mathbb{G}_m$ acts via the homotheties.

Theorem 7.2. *Regard* $V_{r,s}$ *as a representation of* $\mathrm{GO}_n \subset \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m$ *if* n *is odd, or of* $\mathrm{GSp}_n \subset \mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m$ *if* n *is even by restriction. Then:*

(1) *Denote* Ψ^{geom} *to be the underlying complex of sheaves of* $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}[rs](\frac{rs}{2})$ *on* $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}\otimes\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$*. Then*

$$\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}\simeq\mathcal{RS}(V_{r,s})\simeq\begin{cases}\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}} & n \text{ odd}\\ \sum_{s'\geq 0,s-s'\in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-s',s'}} & n \text{ even.}\end{cases}$$

(2) *Let* $r\neq s$*. Then the action of the inertial subgroup* $I\subset\Gamma$ *on* $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ *is trivial so that* $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ *admits a structure as a Weil sheaf on* $\mathcal{F}\ell_v$*. In addition, as Weil sheaves,*

$$\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}[rs](\frac{rs}{2})\simeq\mathcal{RS}(V_{r,s}).$$

(3) *Let* $r=s=m$ *where* $n=2m$*. By (1)*

$$\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}\simeq\sum_{m'\geq 0,m-m'\in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}}.$$

The action of the inertial subgroup I *on* $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ *factors through* $I\to\mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)\simeq\mathbb{Z}/2$*. In addition, the action of* $\mathbb{Z}/2$ *on* $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}}$ *is trivial if* $4\mid m-m'$ *and is through the non-trivial character if* $4\nmid m-m'$*. As Weil sheaves,*

$$(\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}})^I[rs](\frac{rs}{2})\simeq\sum_{m'\geq 0,m-m'\in 4\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}}\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}},$$

where $(\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}})^I$ *denotes the inertial invariants of* $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$*.*

Proof. Observe that Ψ^{geom} is an object in $\mathcal{P}_v$. This follows from Proposition 7.1 (ii). Observe that $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ is a direct summand of Ψ^{geom}. This follows from the fact that $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}$ is flat over $\mathcal{O}_{E_p}$ with special fiber isomorphic to $\mathcal{F}\ell_{v\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$.

The partially flag variety $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}}$ is a Schubert variety in the affine Grassmanian of G_{E_p} over E_p, (see (A.2)). Therefore, $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})$ is a natural representation of $\mathrm{GL}_n\times\mathbb{G}_m$ (the dual group of G_{E_p}), which is indeed just $V_{r,s}$. Since nearby cycles commute with proper push-forward, we have

$$V_{r,s}\simeq\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})\simeq\mathrm{H}^*(\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}). \tag{7.3}$$

Part (i) of the theorem would follow if we can show that this isomorphism is an isomorphism of GO_n or GSp_n-modules. This is indeed the case, and can be shown using the construction in [PZ]. In fact, we will prove the corresponding Part (i) for all ramified groups in [PZ]. Here, we give another argument of Part (i) of the theorem, without showing that (7.3) is an isomorphism of GO_n or GSp_n-modules. However, we do need the existence of this natural isomorphism.

We will first assume that n is odd. Recall that $V_{r,s}$ remains irreducible as a representation of GO_n. Therefore, $\mathcal{RS}(V_{r,s})\simeq\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ and we have

$$\dim V_{r,s}=\dim\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}})\leq\dim\mathrm{H}^*(\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}})=\dim\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})=\dim V_{r,s}.$$

Therefore, $\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}=\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$. As $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ is irreducible, the inertial group I acts on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ via some character. Observe that the action of I on $\mathrm{H}^0(\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}})\simeq\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})\simeq\mathbb{Q}_\ell$ is via the same character, again due to the fact that nearby cycles commute with proper push-forward. But the action of I on $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})$ is trivial since $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}}$ has a rational point. Therefore the action of I on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ is trivial. Therefore, $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}[rs](\frac{rs}{2})\simeq\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}\otimes\mathcal{L}$ for some rank one local system $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathrm{Spec}\mathbb{F}_p$. By comparing the action of Frobenius on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})$ and on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}})$, we conclude the theorem.

If n is even, we need a modified argument since $V_{r,s}$ is not irreducible as a GSp_n-module. In fact, we know that the symplectic form induces a surjective map $V_{r,s}\to V_{r+2,s-2}$ and the kernel is the irreducible representation of GSp_n of highest weight $\bar{\mu}_{r,s}$, denoted by $W_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$. Recall that under the (ramified) geometrical Satake isomorphism, the cohomological grading corresponding to the grading by 2ρ. Therefore, (7.3) is an isomorphism of the representations of $2\rho(\mathbb{G}_m) \subset \mathrm{GSp}_n$. We claim that this already implies Part (i) of the theorem. Indeed, For a representation V of GSp_n, we denote $V(i)$ to be the eigenspace of 2ρ of eigenvalue i. Let us write

$$\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}} = \sum_{m' \geq 0, m-m' \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\leq 0}} c_{m'} \mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}},$$

we need to show that $c_{m'} = 1$. First as in Lemma 2.4, $c_s = 1$ by Proposition 7.1 (iii). Next, we show that $c_{s-2} = 1$. Observe that the gradings on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}})$ range from rs to $-rs$. From

$$\begin{aligned} \dim \mathrm{H}^{(s-2)(r+2)}(\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}) &= c_{s-2} + \dim \mathrm{H}^{(s-2)(r+2)}(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}), \\ \dim V_{r,s}((s-2)(r+2)) &= 1 + \dim(W_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}})((s-2)(r+2)), \end{aligned}$$

we conclude that $c_{s-2} = 1$. Now by induction, $c_{m'} = 1$ for all $m' \geq 0, m - m' \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. This shows that

$$\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}} \simeq \mathcal{RS}(V_{r,s}).$$

Next, we determine the action of the inertial group I on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$. First, assume that $r \neq s$. To show that the action of I on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ is trivial, we again observe that the action of I on each irreducible direct summand of $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ via characters. On the other hand, the group G_{E_p} is split. Therefore, the action of I on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{r,s}})$ is trivial, and therefore on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ is trivial. Again, comparing the action of the Frobenius, we conclude the theorem.

Finally, let us assume that $r = s = m$, where $n = 2m$. Then $E_p = \mathbb{Q}_p$ and $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ is not split. In addition the action of I on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})$ is not trivial. Indeed, as $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}}$ is defined over $\mathbb{Q}_p$, according to the Appendix, $V_{\mu_{m,m}} = \mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})$ is a natural representation of ${}^LG^{geom} = (\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m) \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{geom}} \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$, so that the natural action of $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})$ is given by the restriction of this representation to $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$. This semidirect product $(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m) \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{geom}} \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ is not the Langlands dual group ${}^LG^{alg}_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ of $G_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$. But when restricted to $I \subset \mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$, this semidirect product coincides with the restriction of ${}^LG^{alg}_{\mathbb{Q}_p}$ to I, because the cyclotomic character is trivial on I. On the other hand, since G is split over F_p, the action of I factors through $I \to \mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2$.

Lemma 7.3. *The representation $V_{m,m}$ of $(\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m) \rtimes I$, when restricted to $\mathrm{GSp}_n \rtimes I = \mathrm{GSp}_n \times I$, decomposes as*

$$V_{m,m} = \sum_{m' \geq 0, m-m' \in 2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}} W_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}} \otimes \chi_{m'}, \tag{7.4}$$

where $\chi_{m'}$ is the trivial character of $\mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ if $4 \mid m-m'$, and is the non-trivial character if $4 \nmid m-m'$.

Proof. Clearly, there are some characters $\chi_{m'}$ of $\mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$ such that the decomposition (7.4) holds. We need to identify these characters.

First, it is clear that $\chi_m = 1$. This is because the lowest weight space of $V_{\bar{\mu}_{m,m}}$ is the same as the lowest weight space of $V_{m,m}$, which in turn is the same as $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})$ as I-modules. But the action of I on $\mathrm{H}^0(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})$ is trivial because there is a rational point on $\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}}$. This shows that $\chi_s = 1$.

Now pick up $g \in I$ whose projection to $\mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p) \simeq \mathbb{Z}/2$ is non-trivial. To identify other $\chi_{m'}$, let us write the weight lattice of $\mathrm{GL}_n \times \mathbb{G}_m$ in a standard way to be $\mathbb{X}^\bullet = \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon_i \bigoplus \mathbb{Z}\varepsilon$ and the set of simple roots to be $\{\varepsilon_i - \varepsilon_{i+1}, 1 \leq i \leq n-1\}$. Then the action of g on $\mathbb{X}^\bullet$ will send ε_i to $-\varepsilon_{n+1-i}$ and ε to $\varepsilon + \varepsilon_1 + \cdots + \varepsilon_n$. The weight lattice of GSp_n is $\mathbb{X}^\bullet/\{\varepsilon_i + \varepsilon_{n+1-i} = 0, i = 1, \ldots, s\}$.

Let $\{v_1, \ldots, v_n\}$ be a standard basis of V so that v_i is a weight vector of GL_n of weight ε_i as usual. Then a basis of $V_{m,m}$ is given by $\{v_{i_1} \wedge \cdots \wedge v_{i_s} \mid 1 \leq i_1 < \cdots < i_s \leq n\}$. We divide this set of basis into two subsets A and B. A base vector $v_{i_1}\wedge\cdots\wedge v_{i_s}$ belongs to the subset A if $\{i,n+1-i\}\nsubseteq\{i_1,\ldots,i_s\}$ for any $1\leq i\leq s$. All remaining base vectors belong to B. It is clear that $\mathrm{Span}\{v\mid v\in A\}\subset V_{\bar{\mu}_{m,m}}$ and therefore, the action of g fixes each $v\in A$ since $\chi_s=1$. On the other hand, it is easy to see from the description of the action of g on $\mathbb{X}^\bullet$, that for $v\in B$, gv will be a multiple of some $w\in B, w\neq v$. From this, we deduce that for any t in the maximal torus of GSp_n,

$$\mathrm{tr}(gt,V_{m,m})=\varepsilon(t)\sum\varepsilon_1(t)^{\pm1}\cdots\varepsilon_m(t)^{\pm1}.$$

On the other hand, according to (7.4), we have

$$\mathrm{tr}(gt,V_{m,m})=\sum_{m'\geq0,m-m'\in2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}}\chi_{m'}(g)\,\mathrm{ch}(W_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}})(t).$$

where $\mathrm{ch}(W_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}})$ denotes the character of $W_{\bar{\mu}_{r,s}}$ as a GSp_n-module, and $\chi_{m'}(g)=\pm1$ according to whether $\chi_{m'}$ is trivial or not. Now it is then an elementary exercise in representation theory to show that the above two identities force $\chi_{m'}=1$ if $4\mid m-m'$ and $\chi_{m'}\neq1$ if $4\nmid m-m'$. The lemma is proved. □

Finally, let us finish the prove the the theorem. We know that

$$\Psi^{\mathrm{geom}}=\sum_{m'\geq0,m-m'\in2\mathbb{Z}_{\geq0}}\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}}.$$

As argued in the case $r\neq s$, the action of I on $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ also factors through $I\to\mathrm{Gal}(F_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$. Assume that the action of I on $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}}$ is through the character $\chi'_{m'}$. We need to show that $\chi'_{m'}=\chi_{m'}$. Since $\mathrm{H}^*(\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}})\simeq\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})\simeq V_{m,m}$ as $(2\rho(\mathbb{G}_m)\times I)$-modules, by taking the I-invariants, we obtain that

$$\sum_{\chi'_{m'}=1}\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}})=\sum_{\chi_{m'}=1}W_{\bar{\mu}_{n-m',m'}}.$$

Again, as argued before by considering the gradings, it is easy to see that this forces $\chi'_{m'}=\chi_{m'}$. Finally, by comparing the action of Frobenius on $\mathrm{H}^*(\Psi^I_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}})$ and on $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{P}_{\mu_{m,m}})^I$, we conclude the theorem. □

Combining Theorem 7.2 and Theorem 5.1, it is not hard to obtain the explicit formula of the trace of Frobenius of $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$, which will be the input of the Langlands-Kottwitz method of calculating the local Zeta functor of the Shimura varieties. Instead of write down the explicit formula, let us characterize this function in terms of its trace on "unramified" representations of $G(F)$ (which clearly determines this function uniquely). The characterization verifies a conjecture of Haines and Kottwitz in this case.

Proposition 7.4. *Let $z_{r,s}$ be the function on $G'(F)$ associated to $\Psi_{\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}}$ under the Grothendieck sheaf-function dictionary, and let $V_{r,s}$ be the representation of ${}^LG^{alg}_{E_p}$ attached to $\mu_{r,s}\in\mathbb{X}_\bullet(T)$ as above (or in Corollary A.7). For π an "unramified" representation of $G'(F)$, with the Langlands parameter* $\mathrm{Sat}(\pi)$ *as defined in* (6.2)*, we have*

$$\mathrm{tr}(\pi(z_{r,s})=\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{Sat}(\pi)(\Phi),V^I_{r,s}).$$

The proof is a direct consequence of Theorem 7.2 and (6.1).

Remark 7.1. In the Langlands-Kottwitz methods of calculating the Zeta factors of Shimura varieties, one needs some mysterious test functions z_μ to be put into the trace formula. Assuming the Local Langlands, Haines and Kottwitz give a cojectureal characterization of this test function z_μ in the general setting (i.e. arbitrary group and arbitrary level structure). In the special case when the group is quasi-split and the level structure is special parahoric, in which case the Langlands parameters is clear (as in Sect. 6), their characterization is reduced to the above proposition. Therefore, this proposition is the first example of their conjecture in the case when the group is ramified at p. It will be shown in [PZ] that their conjecture hold for arbitrary quasi-split groups when the level structure is of parahoric type.

Finally, let us make Theorem 7.2 more explicit for some special cases.

Corollary 7.5. *Let* $(r,s)=(n-1,1)$. *Then the inertial group acts on* $\Psi_{Sh_{K_p}}$ *trivially. In addition, As Weil sheaves,* $\Psi_{Sh_{K_p}}\simeq\mathbb{Q}_\ell$. *In particular, for every* $x\in Sh_{K_p}(\mathbb{F}_{p^n})$, $\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{Frob}_x,\Psi_{K_p})=1$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Theorem 7.2 and the local model diagram. We need to show that $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-1,1}}\simeq\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[n-1](\frac{n-1}{2})$. However, according to Theorem 5.1, we know that $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-1,1}}[1-n](\frac{1-n}{2})$ is a sheaf (for the standard t-structure) rather than a complex, with each stalk isomorphic to $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. As $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-1,1}}[1-n](\frac{1-n}{2})$ is indecomposable as object in $D(\mathcal{F}\ell_v)$, this forces $\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-1,1}}[1-n](\frac{1-n}{2})\simeq\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. Now, since $\pi^*\Psi_{K_p}\simeq\varphi^*\mathrm{IC}_{\bar{\mu}_{n-1,1}}[1-n](\frac{1-n}{2})$ and π has geometrically connected fibers, the corollary follows. $\square$

Remark 7.2. Concerning the part of the Frobenius trace, this corollary has been proven in [Kr, PR2, Ri]. Indeed, for the case n is odd, and the special parahoric is $\underline{G}_{v_0}$, this is a main result of [Kr]. In this case, Sh_{K_p} is not semi-stable. For the case n is odd and the parahoric is $\underline{G}_{v_1}$, it is shown in [Ri] that Sh_{K_p} is smooth. For the case n is even, it is shown in [PR2] that Sh_{K_p} is smooth.

Next, we consider the case $(r,s)=(2,2)$. Recall that the local model diagram can be written as a morphism

$$Sh_{K_p}\to[\underline{G}_v\setminus \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}],$$

where $[\underline{G}_v\setminus \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}]$ denotes the stack quotient. Therefore, the Schubert stratification on $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{loc}}_{K_p}\otimes\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$ induces a stratification on $Sh_{K_p}\otimes\overline{\mathbb{F}}_p$, called the Kottwitz-Rapoport (KR) stratification. In the case $(r,s)=(2,2)$, the stratification has two strata $Sh_{K_p,b}$ and $Sh_{K_p,s}$. The smaller one $Sh_{K_p,s}$ is zero-dimensional. Similarly to the previous case, we have

Corollary 7.6. *Let* $(r,s)=(2,2)$. *Then* $\Psi_{Sh_{K_p}}=\Psi^1_{Sh_{K_p}}+\Psi^2_{Sh_{K_p}}$. *The inertial action on* $\Psi^1_{Sh_{K_p}}$ *is trivial and as Weil sheaves,* $\Psi^1_{Sh_{K_p}}\simeq\mathbb{Q}_\ell$. *The vanishing cycle* $\Phi_{Sh_{K_p}}(\mathbb{Q}_\ell)\simeq\Psi^2_{K_p}$. *When forgetting the action of* $\mathrm{Gal}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_p/\mathbb{Q}_p)$, $\Psi^2_{Sh_{K_p}}=\sum_{x\in Sh_{K_p,s}}\delta_x[-4]$, *where* δ_x *is the delta sheaf supported at* x. *In addition, the inertial action on* δ_x *factors through a non-trivial quadratic character. In particular, for every* $x\in Sh_{K_p}(\mathbb{F}_{p^n})$, $\mathrm{tr}(\mathrm{Frob}_x,\Psi^I_{Sh_{K_p}})=1$.

APPENDIX A. THE FULL LANGLANDS DUAL GROUP

joint with Timo Richarz

In the main body of the paper, we considered a reductive group G over $F=k((t))$ (k algebraically closed), split over a tamely ramified extension, and recovered $(H^\vee)^{\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)}$ by the Tannakian formalism from a certain category of perverse sheaves associated to G, where $H^\vee$ is the dual group of G, on which $\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ acts via pinned automorphisms. In this appendix, we take a different point of view to recover the full Langlands dual group ${}^LG=H^\vee\rtimes\mathrm{Gal}(F^s/F)$ of G by the Tannakian formalism. The construction is easy but we can not find it in the literature. Most proofs will be omitted or rather sketched since they are very simple.

Let us begin with a review of certain general nonsense of Tannakian formalism. A similar discussion appears in [HNY, Appendix 2]. Let $(\mathcal{C},\omega)$ be a neutralized Tannakian category over a field k with fiber functor ω. We define a monoidal category $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C},\omega)$ as follows: objects are pairs (σ,α), where $\sigma:\mathcal{C}\to\mathcal{C}$ is a tensor automorphism and $\alpha:\omega\circ\sigma\simeq\omega$ is a natural isomorphism of tensor functors; morphisms between (σ,α) and (σ',α') are natural tensor isomorphisms between σ and σ' that are compatible with α, α' in an obvious way. The monoidal structure is given by compositions. Since ω is faithful, $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$ is (equivalent to) a set, and in fact is a group. For example, $(\sigma, \alpha) = \mathrm{id}$ means that there is an isomorphism $\varepsilon : \sigma \simeq \mathrm{id}$ of tensor functors such that $\omega\varepsilon = \alpha$ (such ε will be unique).

Let $H = \mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}}\omega$, the Tannkian group defined by $(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$. Let $\mathrm{Aut}(H)$ be the group of automorphisms of H and $\mathrm{Out}(H)$ be the group of outer automorphisms of H.

Lemma A.1. *There is a canonical action of* $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$ *on* H *by automorphisms. In addition, the map* $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega) \to \mathrm{Aut}(H)$ *induces* $[\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C})] \to \mathrm{Out}(H)$*, where* $[\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C})]$ *is the group of isomorphism classes of tensor automorphisms of* $\mathcal{C}$*.*

The action of (σ, α) on H is given as follows. Let R be a k-algebra and $h : \omega_R \simeq \omega_R$ is an R-point of H. Then $(\sigma, \alpha)h$ is the following composition

$$\omega_R \overset{\alpha}{\leftarrow} \omega_R \circ \sigma \overset{h\circ\mathrm{id}}{\to} \omega_R \circ \sigma \overset{\alpha}{\to} \omega_R.$$

Remark A.1. As is shown [HNY], $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$ can be upgraded into a *fppf* sheaf on the category of affine schemes over k, and as *fppf* sheaves $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega) \simeq \mathrm{Aut}(H)$. We do not need this fact.

Let Γ be an abstract group. We define an action of Γ on $(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$ to be a group homomorphism $\mathrm{act} : \Gamma \to \mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$. Assume that Γ acts on $(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$. We can then define $\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}$, the category of Γ-equivariant objects in $\mathcal{C}$ as follows: objects are $(X, \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma})$, where X is an object in $\mathcal{C}$ and $c_\gamma : \mathrm{act}_\gamma(X) \simeq X$ is an isomorphism, satisfying the natural cocycle condition, i.e. $c_{\gamma'} \circ \mathrm{act}_{\gamma'}(c_\gamma) = c_{\gamma'\gamma}$; the morphisms between $(X, \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma})$ and $(X', \{c'_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma})$ are morphisms between X and X', compatible with c_γ, c'_γ in an obvious way.

Lemma A.2. *Let* Γ *be a group acting on* $(\mathcal{C}, \omega)$*. Then the category* $\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}$ *is a natural Tannakian category, with fiber functor* ω*. In addition, if* Γ *is a finite group, regarded as an algebraic* k*-group, then the Tannakian group* $\mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}}\omega$ *is canonically isomorphic to* $H \rtimes \Gamma$*.*

Proof. The monoidal structure on $\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}$ is defined as

$$(X, \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}) \otimes (X', \{c'_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}) = (X'', \{c''_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}),$$

where $X'' = X \otimes X'$ and $c''_\gamma : \mathrm{act}_\gamma(X'') \to X''$ is the composition

$$\mathrm{act}_\gamma(X \otimes X') \simeq \mathrm{act}_\gamma(X) \otimes \mathrm{act}_\gamma(X') \xrightarrow{c_\gamma \otimes c'_\gamma} X \otimes X'.$$

This gives $\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}$ the structure of a Tannakian category. Now assume that Γ is finite, and hence $H \rtimes \Gamma$ is an affine group scheme. By [DM, Prop. 2.8], it is enough to show that,

$$\mathrm{Rep}(H)^{\Gamma} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \mathrm{Rep}(H \rtimes \Gamma)$$

as tensor categories compatible with the forgetful functors. Let $((V, \rho), \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma}) \in \mathrm{Rep}(H)^{\Gamma}$. Then we define $(V, \tilde{\rho}) \in \mathrm{Rep}(H \rtimes \Gamma)$, for any k-algebra R $(h, \gamma) \in (H \rtimes \Gamma)(R)$, by

$$(h, \gamma) \longmapsto \rho(h) \circ \alpha_{g,R}(V) \circ \omega_R \circ c_\gamma^{-1} \in \mathrm{GL}(V \otimes R),$$

where $\alpha_{g,R} : \omega_R \circ \sigma_g \simeq \omega_R$ is induced by the action of Γ as above. Using the cocycle relation one checks that this is indeed a representation, and that the map defines the desired equivalence. □

Remark A.2. If Γ is not finite, then the category $(\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}, \omega)$ is still Tannakian, but $\tilde{H} = \mathrm{Aut}^{\otimes}_{\mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}}\omega$ is no longer $H \rtimes \Gamma$ since the latter cannot be regarded as an affine group scheme. However, there is always a group homomorphism

$$H \rtimes \Gamma \to \tilde{H}.$$

Although this is not an isomorphism in general, we may still regard $\omega(X)$ for $X \in \mathcal{C}^{\Gamma}$ as a representation of $H \rtimes \Gamma$.

Now, we assume that G is a connected reductive group over *any* field k. We switch the notation to use $G^\vee$ to denote the reductive group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$ dual to G in the sense of Langlands, i.e. the root datum of $G^\vee$ is dual to the root datum of G_{k^s}. Up to the choice of a pinning $(G^\vee, B^\vee, T^\vee, X^\vee)$ of $G^\vee$, we have an action of $\Gamma_k = \mathrm{Gal}(k^s/k)$ on $G^\vee$ via

$$\Gamma_k \to \mathrm{Out}(G_{k^s}) \simeq \mathrm{Out}(G^\vee) \simeq \mathrm{Aut}(G^\vee, B^\vee, T^\vee, X^\vee). \tag{A.1}$$

Then the Langlands dual group ${}^LG$ is defined to be $G^\vee \rtimes \Gamma_k$. Our goal is to recover this group via the above Tannakian formalism.

Let

$$\mathrm{Gr}_G = LG/L^+G \tag{A.2}$$

be the affine Grassmannian of G over k. Let $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s$ be its base change to the separable closure of k. According to [Zh2, Lemma 3.3], formation of the affine Grassmannian commutes with étale base change, we have $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s \simeq \mathrm{Gr}_{G_{k^s}}$. Since G_{k^s} is split, we can consider the usual Satake category Sat on $\mathrm{Gr}_{G_{k^s}}$, i.e. the category of $(L^+G \otimes k^s)$-equivariant perverse sheaves on $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s$, which is equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(G^\vee_{\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell})$ via the geometrical Satake correspondence. Note that the Galois group Γ_k acts on $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s$. For $\gamma \in \Gamma_k$, the pullback functor $\gamma^* : D(\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s) \to D(\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s)$ clearly restricts to a functor $\gamma^* : \mathrm{Sat} \to \mathrm{Sat}$. In addition, there is a canonical isomorphism $\alpha_\gamma : \mathrm{H}^*(\gamma^*\mathcal{F}) \simeq \mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F})$.

Lemma A.3. *The assignment* $\gamma \mapsto (\gamma^*, \alpha_\gamma)$ *defines an action of* Γ_k *on* $(\mathrm{Sat}, \mathrm{H}^*)$.

According to Lemma A.1, there is a canonical action of Γ_k on $G^\vee$, denoted by act^{geom}. And we can form

$${}^LG^{geom} := G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{geom}} \Gamma_k,$$

which we will call the geometrical Langlands dual group.

Now, our goal is to understand the relation between ${}^LG^{geom}$ and the usual Langlands dual group ${}^LG$. Recall that in Sect. 4, we explained that the geometrical Satake isomorphism provides $G^\vee$ a canonical pinning $(G^\vee, B^\vee, T^\vee, X^\vee)$. Therefore, there is an action of Γ_k on $G^\vee$ via (A.1), denoted by act^{alg}. Then we can form the usual Langlands dual group by ${}^LG^{alg} = G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \Gamma_k$. It turns out that the difference between act^{geom} and act^{alg} can be described explicitly.

Let

$$\mathrm{cycl} : \Gamma_k \to \mathbb{Z}_\ell^\times$$

be the cyclotomic character of Γ_k defined by the action of Γ_k on the ℓ^∞-roots of unity of k^s. We define a map

$$\chi : \Gamma_k \overset{\mathrm{cycl}}{\to} \mathbb{Z}_\ell^\times \overset{2\rho}{\to} G^\vee(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell),$$

which gives a map $\mathrm{Ad}_\chi : \Gamma_k \to \mathrm{Aut}(G^\vee)$ to the inner automorphism of $G^\vee$.

Proposition A.4.

$$\mathrm{act}^{geom} = \mathrm{act}^{alg} \circ \mathrm{Ad}_\chi$$

Proof. First, it is clear that

$$[\mathrm{act}^{geom}] = [\mathrm{act}^{alg}] : \Gamma_k \to \mathrm{Aut}(G^\vee) \to \mathrm{Out}(G^\vee).$$

Therefore, act^{geom} and act^{alg} differ by an inner automorphism of $G^\vee$. Let $h : \Gamma_k \to G^\vee_{\mathrm{ad}}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$ be the group homomorphism so that $\mathrm{act}^{geom} = \mathrm{act}^{alg} \circ \mathrm{Ad}_h$, where $G^\vee_{\mathrm{ad}}$ is the adjoint group of $G^\vee$. Since the action of Γ_k perverses the cohomological grading, the map factors through $h : \Gamma_k \to T^\vee_{\mathrm{ad}}(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell)$. Now the proposition follows from the fact that Γ_k acts on $X^\vee$ through cycl since $X^\vee$ is the Chern class of the determinant line bundle. □

Corollary A.5. *We have* ${}^LG^{alg} \xrightarrow{\simeq} {}^LG^{geom}$ *given by*

$$(g, \gamma) \mapsto (\mathrm{Ad}_{\chi(\gamma^{-1})}(g), \gamma).$$

Following [Bo, 2.6], we define the notation of the algebraic representations of ${}^LG^{alg}$ as follows. For every $k' \subset k^s$ finite over k such that $G_{k'}$ is split, one can form the "finite form" of Langlands dual group $G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$, which can be regarded as an algebraic group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. Therefore, we may ${}^LG^{alg} = \varprojlim G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$ as a pro-algebraic group over $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$, Then it makes sense to talk about $\mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg})$, which is the inductive limit of $\mathrm{Rep}(G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k))$.

Now, we consider certain category of perverse sheaves. First, according to the above discussions, we call the action of Γ_k on Sat via $\gamma \mapsto (\gamma^*, \alpha_\gamma)$ as in Lemma A.3 the geometrical action. We can also define an algebraic action of Γ_k on Sat as $\gamma \mapsto (\gamma^*, \chi(\gamma)^{-1}\alpha_\gamma\chi(\gamma))$. Clearly, there is an canonically isomorphism between $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom}$ and $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg}$ sending $(\mathcal{F}, \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma_k})$ to $(\mathcal{F}, \{c_\gamma\}_{\gamma\in\Gamma_k})$. The reason we distinguish them is due to the following observation: since the algebraic action of Γ_k on $G^\vee$ factors through $\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$ if $G_{k'}$ is split, the algebraic action of Γ_k on Sat also factors through $\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$, and therefore it makes sense to talk about $\mathrm{Sat}^{\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k),alg}$, which is naturally a full category of $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg}$. In addition, according to Lemma A.2, $\mathrm{Sat}^{\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k),alg}$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Rep}(G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k))$. Now, let $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg,f} \subset \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg}$ be the full subcategory, which is the union of all $\mathrm{Sat}^{\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k),alg}$. We obtain that

$$\mathrm{H}^* : \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg,f} \simeq \mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg}).$$

We next goal then is to identify $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg,f}$ as a subcategory of $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom}$.

As Γ_k is a topological group, a natural guess would be the full subcategory of $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom,ct}$, consisting of objects on which Γ_k acts continuously. Equivalent, let $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ be the category of perverse sheaves on Gr_G. Then the pullback functor to $\mathrm{Gr}_G \otimes k^s$ induces $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \simeq \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom,ct}$. However, it is not the case that $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom,ct} = \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg,f}$.

Definition A.1. (i) Let X be a smooth variety over k, we define a constant sheaf to be a direct sum of $(\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell[1](\frac{1}{2}))^{\otimes \dim X}$.

(ii) We define $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ to be the full subcategory of $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$, consisting of those sheaves $\mathcal{F}$, such that there exists some $k' \supset k$ such that $\mathcal{F} \otimes k'$ is constant along each $(L^+G \otimes k')$-orbit.

Remark A.3. (i) The toy model is when $G = \{e\}$ is the trivial group. Then $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ is the category $\Gamma_k-\mathrm{Mod}$ of continuous representations of Γ_k while $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ is the subcategory $\Gamma_k-\mathrm{Mod}^f$ consisting of representations of finite quotients of Γ_k. In particular, if k is a finite field, we can identify the latter as the category of semi-simple Γ_k-modules, pure of weight zero.

(ii) Observe that every object in $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ is of the form $\oplus_i \mathrm{IC}_i \otimes \mathcal{L}_i$, where IC_i is an intersection cohomology sheaf on Gr_G, and $\mathcal{L}_i$ is a representation of Γ_k. Therefore, $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ if and only if all $\mathcal{L}_\mu \in \Gamma_k-\mathrm{Mod}^f$. In particular, if $k = \mathbb{F}_q$ is a finite field, the category $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ is equivalent to the category of semi-simple L^+G-equivariant perverse sheaves on Gr_G, pure of weight zero.

Proposition A.6. *Under the canonical isomorphism* $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom} = \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg}$*, we have the identification*

$$\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) = \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg,f}.$$

Therefore, we obtain an equivalence of tensor categories

$$\mathrm{H}^* : \mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \to \mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg}).$$

Proof. Let $k' \supset k$ such that $G_{k'}$ splits. We denote $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G,k'}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ the full subcategory of $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ consisting of those $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\mathcal{F} \otimes k'$ is constant along each $(L^+G \otimes k')$-orbit. Then under

$$\mathcal{P}_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \to \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom} \simeq \mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,alg},$$

$\mathcal{P}_{L^+G,k'}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$ maps to $\mathrm{Sat}^{\mathrm{Gal}(k'/k),alg}$. To see this, one reduces to the case when G is split over k and $k' = k$. In this case $\mathcal{P}_{L^+G,k}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \simeq \mathrm{Sat}$ and this statement is clear. □

For every $\mathcal{F} \in \mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$, let us describe $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathcal{F})$ as a representation of ${}^LG^{alg}$ more explicitly. First, as an object in $\mathrm{Sat}^{\Gamma_k,geom}$, it is a natural representation of ${}^LG^{geom}$, on which $G^\vee$ acts via the usual geometrical Satake isomorphism, and Γ_k acts via the natural Galois action. Then the action of ${}^LG^{alg}$ is via (A.5).

In particular, if $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$ is a Schubert variety in Gr_G defined over k (i.e., the conjugacy class of the one-parameter subgroup determined by μ is defined over k), then $\mathrm{IC}_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu}$ is an object in $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$. Therefore, $\mathrm{H}^*(\mathrm{IC}_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu})$ is a representation of $G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$, where k' is the splitting field of G. We thus obtain

Corollary A.7. *Let V_μ be a representation of $G^\vee$ of highest weight μ. If the conjugacy class of the one parameter subgroup $\mu : \mathbb{G}_m \to G_{k^s}$ is defined over k, then V_μ can be extended canonically to a representation of $G^\vee \rtimes_{\mathrm{act}^{alg}} \mathrm{Gal}(k'/k)$, where k' is the splitting field of G.*

Now we specialize to the case that $k = \mathbb{F}_q$ is a finite field, so that $G \otimes k[[t]]$ is a hyperspecial group scheme for the unramified group $G_{k((t))}$. Note that ${}^LG^{alg}_{k((t))} = {}^LG^{alg}$. We therefore obtain the geometrical Satake isomorphism for unramified groups.

Theorem A.8. *Let $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(Gr_G)$ be the category of semi-simple, L^+G-equivariant perverse sheaves on Gr_G, pure of weight zero. Then we have an equivalence of tensor categories*

$$\mathrm{H}^* : \mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G) \simeq \mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg}).$$

Let σ be the Frobenius element in Γ_k. Denote by $\mathcal{H}_G$ the Grothendieck ring of $\mathcal{P}^f_{L^+G}(\mathrm{Gr}_G)$, tensored with $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$. Likewise by $\mathcal{R}_{^LG}$ the algebra associated to $\mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg})$. Theorem A.8 gives an isomorphism of algebras

$$\Phi : \mathcal{H}_G \to \mathcal{R}_{^LG}.$$

Let H_G be the spherical Hecke algebra of compactly supported bi-$G(\mathbb{F}_q[[t]])$-invariant functions. Let $\mathrm{R}_{^LG}$ be the algebra of $\overline{\mathbb{Q}}_\ell$-valued functions on $(G^\vee \times \sigma)_{ss}$, generated by the characters of elements in $\mathrm{Rep}({}^LG^{alg})$. Here, $(G^\vee \times \sigma)_{ss}$ is the set of semi-simple elements in $G^\vee \times \sigma$, as defined in [Bo, Sect. 6]. We have a surjective map of algebras $\mathrm{Tr} : \mathcal{H}_G \to \mathrm{H}_G$ (resp. $\mathrm{Ch} : \mathcal{R}_{^LG} \to \mathrm{R}_{^LG}$) given by the trace of Frobenius (resp. by sending a representation to its character). Recall that by [Bo, 6.7] the classical Satake isomorphism gives an isomorphism of algebras

$$\phi : \mathrm{H}_G \to \mathrm{R}_G\,.$$

Lemma A.9. $\mathrm{Ch} \circ \Phi = \phi \circ \mathrm{Tr}$

Proof. Fix a maximal k-split torus A of G. Let T be its centralizer (a maximal torus since G is quasi-split). It is easy to see that the Lemma holds for T. The general case follows from this by embedding the algebras corresponding to G into the algebras corresponding to T. □

In particular, if $\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu$ is a Schubert variety in Gr_G defined over k, then the trace of Frobenius on $\mathrm{IC}_{\overline{\mathrm{Gr}}_\mu}$ is under the classical Satake isomorphism equal to the character of the irreducible representation V_μ of ${}^LG^{alg}$ of highest weight μ, as definied in Corollary A.7.

REFERENCES

[Be] R. Bezrukavnikov, *On tensor categories attached to cells in affine Weyl groups*, Representation theory of algebraic groups and quantum groups, 69–90, Adv. Stud. Pure Math., 40, Math. Soc. Japan, Tokyo, 2004.

[Bo] Borel, A.: *Automorphic L-functions*, Proceedings of Symposia in Pure Mathematics Vol. 33 (1979), part 2, pp. 27-61.

[Bry] Brylinski, R. K.: *Limits of weight spaces, Lusztigs q-analogs, and fibering of coajoint orbits*, Journ. A.M.S., 2 (1989) 517C534.

[Car] Cartier, P.: *Representations of p-adic groups: a survey*, in: Automorphic Forms, Representations and L-functions, Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., vol. 33, part 1, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1979, pp. 111C155.

[DM] Deligne, P., Milne, J.: *Tannakian categories*, in Hodge Cycles and Motives, Lecture Notes in Math. 900 (1982) 101C228.

[G1] Gaitsgory, D.: *Construction of central elements in the affine Hecke algebra via nearby cycles*, Invent. Math. 144 (2001), no. 2, 253–280.

[G2] Gaitsgory, D: *Braided compatibility*, appendix to [Be].

[Gi] Ginzburg, V.: *Perverse sheaves and a loop group and Langlands' duality*, arXiv:alg-geom/9511007.

[HR] Haine, T., Rostami, S.: *The Satake isomorphism for special maximal parahoric Hecke algebras*, Represent. Theory 14 (2010), 264-284, arXiv:0907.4506.

[HNY] Heinloth, J., Ngô, B.C., Yun, Z.: *Kloomsterman sheaves for reductive groups*, arXiv:1005.2765.

[Kr] N. Krämer: *Local models for ramified unitary groups*, Ab. Math. Sem. Univ. Hamburg 73 (2003), 67C80.

[Lu] Lusztig, G.: *Singularities, character formulas, and a q-analog of weight multiplicities*, Analysis and topology on singular spaces, II, III (Luminy, 1981), 208–229, Astérisque, 101-102, Soc. Math. France, Paris, 1983.

[MV] Mirković, I.; Vilonen, K. Geometric Langlands duality and representations of algebraic groups over commutative rings. Ann. of Math. (2) 166 (2007), no. 1, 95–143.

[Pa] Pappas, G.: *On the arithmetic moduli schemes of PEL Shimura varieties*, J. Algebraic Geom. 9 (2000), no. 3, 577C605.

[PR1] Pappas, G., Rapoport, M.: *Twisted loop groups and their affine flag varieties*, Adv. in Math., 219 (2008) 118-198.

[PR2] Pappas, G., Rapoport, M.: *Local models in the ramified case. III. Unitary groups*, J. Inst. Math. Jussieu 8 (2009), no. 3, 507C564.

[PZ] Pappas, G., Zhu, X.: *Local models and a conjecture of Kottwitz'*, preprint.

[Ri] Richarz, T.: *Local models and Schubert varieties in twisted affine Grassmannians*, arXiv:1011.5416.

[St] R. Steinberg: Endomorphisms of linear algebraic groups. Memoirs of the American Mathematical Society, No. 80 American Mathematical Society, Providence, R.I. 1968 108 pp.

[YZ] Yun, Z., Zhu, X.: *Integral homology of loop groups via Langlands dual groups*, Represent. Theory 15 (2011), 347–369, arXiv:0909.5487.

[Zh1] Zhu, X.: *Affine Demazure modules and T-fixed point subschemes in the affine Grassmannian*, Adv. Math. 221 (2009), no. 2, 570–600, arXiv:0710.5247.

[Zh2] Zhu, X.: *On the coherence conjecture of Pappas and Rapoport*, arXiv: 1012.5979.

Xinwen Zhu: Department of Mathematics, Harvard University, one Oxford Street, Cambridge, MA 02138, USA

E-mail address: `xinwenz@math.harvard.edu`